

PAID 13 302 in Flexman,

Truth Tryd :
OR,
Mr. AGATE's
PRETENDED
PLAIN-TRUTH
Proved an
UNTRUTH:
IN WHICH

HIS FALSE STORIES and UNFAIR-
QUOTATIONS are Detected ; His Charge of
JESUITISM and DONATISM against the
DISSENTERS is Retorted, And their AGREE-
MENT with all FOREIGN PROTESTANTS
in Point of ORDINATION, is further Manifested.

By **JOHN WITHERS.** *K*

*JOB 11. 2, 3. Should not the Multitude of Words be
Answered? And should a Man full of Talk be Justi-
fied? Should thy Lies make Men hold their Peace?
When thou Mockest shall no Man make thee Asham'd?*

Familiares est omnibus etiam Hæreticis in publicis Congres-
sibus se jactare; in Concionibus Dominari, in Conven-
tibus gloriari; DISPUTATIONES cupide re-
quirere. *Jesuitismi, Pars 1. p. 92.*

Dicebant (Manichæi) Veritas! Veritas! Et nunquam
erat in eis. *Aug. Confes. L. 3. C. 6.*

EXON:

Printed by *Jos. Bliss* in the Exchange, and Sold by the
Bookfellers of *Exon.* MDCCVIII.

Truth
OR
Mr. AGATE'S
PRETENDED
PLAIN-TRUTH



UNTRUTH
His FALSE STORIES and UNFAIR
QUOTATIONS are Detected: His Charge of
JESUITISM and DONATISM against the
Dissenters is Refuted, And their GROSS
MISTAKE in all FORMER PROTESTANTS
in Point of ORDINATION is further manifested.

By JOHN WITHERS.

For the Author, at the Methodist of W. and
A. Street, and for the Bookseller, at the
and for the Author, at the Methodist of W. and
A. Street, and for the Bookseller, at the

Printed and Published by J. W. and
A. Street, in London, at the
and for the Author, at the Methodist of W. and
A. Street, and for the Bookseller, at the

Printed by J. W. and
A. Street, in London, at the
and for the Author, at the Methodist of W. and
A. Street, and for the Bookseller, at the

To the Reader.

IF any Thing creates an Uneasiness in me upon the Account of this present Controversy, 'tis that I am Engaged against an Adversary, who, instead of Arguing like a Gentleman or a Scholar, seems to Propound no other End unto himself but to Beshatter and Throw Dirt; for which Reason, I have been perswaded by some to take no Notice of this Part of his Performance: But since, by a Collection of Infamous Stories, he has endeavoured to represent Us as Black as Hell, I think my self under an Obligation of letting the World see, that they are either FALSE in their own Nature, or IMPERTINENT in their Application; and that it is Defamation, rather than Conviction, which Mr. AGATE aims at. To this End, he consults those Scoundrel Pamphlets which their very Authors are Ashamed to own; and considers not the Veracity and Truth of a Tale, but its Aptitude and Fitness to Asperse a PRESBYTERIAN. If he lights upon a Dose of Poison, which may rankle and envenome Peoples Minds against Dissenters, tho' 'twere first disgorged by the Old Serpent, he greedily licks it up himself, and very formally recommends it unto others.

THE Reader may observe this Remarkable Difference between my Performance and that of my Antagonist; I have advanced nothing as Matter of Fact, for which I have not named my Vouchers, or else am ready to do it; but this Gentleman will not descend to Particulars, for fear the Calumny should be confuted. Thus he endeavours to possess the World, That the Dissenters in EXON have a great Mind to knock out his Brains, (to make Sauce, I suppose, for their Calves Heads, were there enough of 'em) but where these Utopian Canibals are to be found, or by what Titles they are dignified and distinguished, that is a Secret we must by no means be acquainted with.

IF the Reader is desirous to know, out of what Magazines Mr. AGATE has fetched those Weapons with which We are so Rudely Assaulted. He may please to understand, that the Learned Doctor at PLYMOUTH

To the Reader.

told me, and a Gentleman in my Company, That he sent him a great part of those Stories which relate to Jesuites and Popish Emissaries: Adding, That he had furnished him with Materials for his 2d Book, particularly to prove, That the Presbyterians began the War, That they Killed the KING, and did not Restore the SON. Which General Heads comprehend a great part of his 2d Book. His Remarks upon the Donatists, together with his Quotations out of Austin and Optatus, are almost all Borrowed from Mr. Long's History of that Sect; and what he cites from Foreign Divines, may be met with in Dnrel, Mason, or the latter end of Stillingfleet's Irenicum. Thus hath he rifled 2 or 3 English Authors, and so sets up for a Man of Letters, whereas should every Bird but pluck his own Feathers, he that now looks so spruce and gay in his borrow'd Plumes, might be as naked as Æsop's Crow, and as much the Derision of Spectators. I have taken no Notice in this Treatise of the Divine Right of Diocesan Bishops; what I have to offer on that Head, being reserved 'till Mr. AGATE shall oblige the World with his Third Part. There is but One Thing in this Gentleman's Preface on which I shall make a particular Animadversion, and that is his Attempt to make me odious, by telling the World, That my Principles may be found in the Rights of the Church, and that the Author of that Book pronounces it a thing Indifferent, whether we believe there is a GOD or no. Upon my desiring him to shew me this Passage, he confess'd there was no such Expression in the whole Book, but this he pretended was the Consequence of that Author's Doctrine, because he would allow God Almighty to have no Priests. If I mistake not, that Gentlemans Error lies in the other Extream, in allowing GOD too many Priests, and giving every one a License to Invade the Sacerdotal Function; were it otherwise, I can't see that a Denial of the Priesthood necessarily infers the Disowning of the Deity. This Accusation therefore must be looked upon as a gross Abuse, and gives just Reason to apprehend, that his Book is of a piece with his Preface, which begins with Fooling, goes on with Railing, and ends in a downright Forgery.

Truth Try'd:

Mr. Agate's Pretended Plain Truth proved an Untruth.

IT's not my Design to introduce my Discourse, like Mr. Agate, with a Pretence to *Expedition*, and at the same time sit Brooding, 13 or 14 Months together, on a parcel of rotten, stinking Eggs: For which Cause, I shall not surfeit my Reader with a nauseous Repetition of what has been already spoken to, and what occurred at our Intended Conference; nor further debate the Matter with him, whether I or himself be the greater *Mountebank*; the Fortunes of *Cæsar*, or Welfare of *Europe*, do not depend on the resolving of that Question. They that reflect upon what has been done and said by both of us, may judge as they see cause; but to call a Minister *Quack*, is, says this Gentleman, [p. 7.] to burlesque his Function; and is a Name too coarse for a Person that represents Almighty God. This is just as if I should infer, that when the Bishop he tells us of [p. 46.] was Hanged for an Unnatural Crime, the Law and Justice of the Nation did execute the Episcopal Office, and that Stringing-up was too coarse an Usage for him. To be serious; Was he representing the God of Truth, when he told his People, That the Sacrament, in Cromwel's Time, was not Administred for 12 Years together in the University of Oxford: Or had he any Commission from his Maker, to turn his Back on St. Paul and the Four Evangelists, to amuse his Hearers with the Dreams and Whimies of Father *Lessy*? But I shall wave the further debating of this Matter, it being my Resolution to keep close to Matter of Fact and Argument. I have no Inclination to write a tedious

Paraphrase on every Sentence, much less to put an innocent Expression on the Rack, and extort from it such a criminal Meaning as it is no way conscious of: The Glory of such an Achievement, I shall willingly leave to my Opponent. What I chiefly aim at, is, To make *Remarks* on the *False Stories* and *Fallacious Arguings* of the *Pamphlet* before me, and to *Antidote* the *Reader* against the Malignity and Poison of it. I have neither a Disposition to *recriminate* and *aspersion* the *Established Church*, or any other Society of Men; nor have I any *Learned Doctor* or *Divine* to send me their *Collections*, or furnish me with *Memoirs* on that Head. I am fully perswaded, that my Time may be spent to much better purpose, than to Scold with an *Oyster-Wench*, throw Dirt with a *Scavenger*, or (which some will say is much the same) to write *Lampoons* and *Banter* with my *Antagonist*.

WHEN I first offered to Debate the Matter with this Gentleman in Print, I thought that all Noise and Clamour about a *Disputation* would have been for ever quashed and silenced, and that the lesser had been included in the greater. Little did I dream of being Insulted on that Head; Must I therefore be ashamed of my Principles, because I publish them to the whole World? Must I therefore be a Coward, because I rather chose to fight my Adversary on the Publick Stage, where the Eyes of all Men are upon us, than to sneak into a Corner, where there are only half a Score Spectators? Had he not told me himself in his *Preface*, That he intended to play the Fool, I could never have imagined, that he would have resembled me to a *Donatist*, for declining of a Conference, whilst I was conferring with him in the most notorious, publick Manner, that the Nature of the Thing was capable of.

'TIS true, I had no great Inclination to Dispute in a Crowd, to be Teaz'd and Baited for the Diversion of the Rabble; for as I had never any great Opinion of the Civility of a *High-Church Mob*, so have I less Reason than ever to expect a candid Treatment from them, since I have been my self an Eye-Witness of those Insolent Affronts they so lately offered to the most Eminent Dignitary at that time in the *Diocese*, because he gave his Vote contrary to their Humour in a late Election of *Parliament Men*. However, though I had no great Fondness to be worried by the Noisy Tribe, who make so loud a SOUND for Mr. A's Cause, yet I have, again and again, declared my Readiness to discourse him before a select Company of Friends; But this will not content him, we must meet, and bring Scribes,
and

and set our Names to what is offered by us. But to what End is all this Parade and Ceremony insisted on? Is it to give Satisfaction to those that are present? If so, this may be done as well by a Verbal Disputation. Or is it to satisfy all others, that think it worth their while to enquire into those Matters? If so, the most effectual Method we can take is to publish our Arguments, and debate the Matter before all the World: For why should we trouble the Scribe, when we are employing the Printer?

THOUGH Experience taught me so much the Humour of my *Antagonist*, that I expected a Noise and Clamour from him about such Things as had but a small Relation to the main *Controversy*; yet I never thought he would have been so very Trifling and Impertinent, as to spend 8 or 10 Pages in toiling about the broken *Handkerchief*. I shall leave him to divert himself with his *Vehicles* and *Wheel-barrows*, not thinking it worth my Labour to follow him in such a *Wild-Goose Chase*. I know not whether his critical Remark [p. 10.], that I have printed a *Greek Word* with a *Final Sigma* in the middle of it, deserves any Reply to be made to it; but if it be a necessary Consequence that therefore I understand not my *Greek Testament*, 'twill follow, by the same Rule, that he understands not *Latin*; for in the 13th Page of his Performance, we have *Latranes* instead of *Latrones*, though he was as near the Press as I am. But to insist on these Things is to *Quibble*, rather than to *Argue*.

IN discoursing of the Original Primary Signification of the Word *Schism*, I might affirm, That it properly signifies a *Rent*, and that the *tearing a Handkerchief* was (in this Sense) a *Schism*; though I cannot recollect any thing of this Nature, yet do I not deny it. And this is no more than some of the most Learned Writers on this Subject have observed before me; as Dr. Hammond, when treating of *Schism*, informs us, That the *Origination* of the Word from the *Greek* signifies literally *Scissure* or *Divisjon* *. That the word *Schism* is since, by long Custom, restrained to an Ecclesiastical Sense, is what I never did deny.

WERE it not for a prevailing Byass of Ill-Nature in our *Author*, and a Resolution to pick Quarrels, I could never have thought my self in danger of being Banter'd and Insulted for as-

* Hammond of *Schism*, Chap. 2.

firming [p. 13.] That *there are several Degrees of Schism, some higher and some lower; or that this had been* (as he calls it) *a publishing my own Shame.* Is there any Criminal Action whatsoever that is not more or less aggravated, according to that variety of Circumstances, that it is clothed with? I would ask this profound *Casualist*, Whether the Murder of *K. Charles* was not a greater Villany than the Murder of another Person, though equally *Innocent*, yet less *Eminent* than himself? Is it not the Language of the *Holy Ghost*, That he who *Sins Ignorantly shall be beaten with few Stripes, whilst he that knows his Master's Will, and doth it not, shall be beaten with many?* Does it not argue an Excess of Peevishness, nor carp at so true and innocent an Expression?

BUT the Spirit of Contradiction seems to be moved beyond measure [p. 14.] upon my supposing every Defect of Love, every Alienation of Affection, to be a lower Degree of Schism: 'Tis manifest, he says [p. 15.], I do not believe it my self. And I am gravely ask'd, Whether a Man may not be Uncharitable without going to a Conventicle; and whether these *Ill Qualities* may be nowhere found but amongst Dissenters? I assure him, I make no Question but they may; whilst he himself is such a Notorious, Flaming Instance of it, I cannot possibly change my Mind. But let us hear what he offers by way of Confutation: He tells us then [p. 16.], That *Riack of Church Communion is the Form and Essence of Schism.* And Banters us for supposing that the Point lies in the Difference of People's Affections and Qualities; in so much, that one Man, provided he be ill-humoured, may be a Schismatick, and another that is Good-humoured shall be none, though they were both Members of the same Communion. Concluding his Harangue with this Tragical Exclamation, I believe no Mortal before ever put such Fancies in Print.

I cannot conceive the Design of such an Extravagant Rant, unless it be to let us see that he knows as little in what part of the Bible to find Schism, as he did when he first met Mr. Hallet, where to find a Bishop; but somewhere 'twas, in the Acts, or one of St. Paul's Epistles. How far this Gentleman has shot his Bolt beside the Mark, the Reader may easily perceive, if he please to consult St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians; which Church was the most remarkable Instance of Schism and Divisions, of any that we meet with in the New Testament: When you come together in the Church, I hear (says St. Paul) that there be Divisions among you, 1 Cor. II. 18. In the Original

Check the Words are, *There are Schism amongst you*. Now
 here, among those Christians, there was no *Breach of Commu-
 nion*, for they assembled in the *Church*, and came together into
 one place, vi. 20. If Mr. Agate says there was no *Schism* in
 this *Church*, he contradicts the *Apostle*, who most expressly has
 affirmed it: If he say, there may be *Schism* without *Breach of
 Church Communion*, he contradicts himself; unless he will
 pretend there may be *Schism* without the very *Form* and *Es-
 sence* of the Thing, which is a Contradiction to the Common
 Sense and Reason of Mankind. Thus he stumbles at the very
 Threshold, and no sooner is he launched, but he splits upon a
 Rock; and though I will allow him to be as much a *Master
 of Arts* as most Men in the *Noble Science* of *Shuffle* and *Eva-
 sion*, yet he may tuggle and sweat long enough before he will be
 able to get himself clearly off. And thus it is evident, that there was a most Notorious *Schism*
 at this time in *Corinth*; though the Contagion was too gene-
 ral, yet we have Reason to hope and believe, that there were
 some particular Persons that were not infected by it. When
 therefore my Opponent is disposed to be Serious, I would ask
 him this plain Question; What other Difference was there be-
 tween the *Schismatick* and the good *Christian* in that *Church*,
 but that the one was *Censorious*, *Quarrelsome* and *Ill-humou-
 red*, whilst the other was *Charitable* and *Good-humoured*?
 Let the Reader judge by these few Hints, whether he has any
 Reason to make so loud a Noise and Clamour, to deny affirm-
 ing *Schism* to consist, in some measure, in *Uncharitableness* or
Ill-humour. And when I affirm, that the lower degrees of
Schism may be reckoned amongst *Sins of Infirmity*, I am so far
 from being singular in my Opinion, that an eminent *Di-
 vine* of his own *Church* says down this very Proposition *:
*That all schism is not damnable; nor doth it carry such Obla-
 quity with it, as to exclude the Person thus offending from
 God's Favour; yet for those who act against the Conscience
 of their own Conscience, (says the Doctor) I grant their Se-
 paration to be damnable; but for the weaker Brother, the Per-
 son, or Church, which out of Frailty only is Schismatical, I un-
 dertake to be an Advocate; and free such, though not from
 Crime; yet, upon general Repentance for unknown Sins, from
 the said Sentence of Damnation.*

BE-
 Whitby's Rom. Doctr. not from the begin. p. 420, 421.

BEFORE I come to consider Mr. A's high Charge of *Je-
suitism* and *Donatism*, it may not be amiss to set some *Mat-
ters of Fact* in a clear light, and to pull off the *Mask* with
which PLAIN TRUTH hath been disguised by him.

HE affirmed in his *first Pamphlet*, p. 77. That he never
gave us one Challenge. To refresh his Memory, in my *De-
fence* I produced One *positive* Witness; and minded him of his
frequent *Railing* against us, on purpose to bring us to a *Confe-
rence*. This Account Mr. Mallet had from Mr. G----'s own
Mouth, in whose House those *Vaunts* had been often made.
To this Mr. Ag. answers [*Pl. Truth*, p. 22.], That Mr. G----
was in Cornwall the same time he is charged with this *Asserti-
on*. Upon view of this Passage, I wrote a Letter to Mr. G----
desiring him to give me Satisfaction as to this Particular. He
declined returning me any Answer in Writing, but affirmed to
Mr. Bernard Bere, (who convey'd my Letter to him) and
others, That he had not been in Cornwall for several Years past,
and that Mr. Agate was mistaken in this Particular.

IN my first Papers I had told the World, That it was agreed
upon, between Mr. Hallet and Mr. Agate, that what was writ-
ten at the Conference, should, after it had been read to the
Company, be thrown into the Fire, and so burnt. This Mr. A-
gate, in his Reply, calls a glaring *Falshood*; denies that he
ever consented to this Proposal, and pours out a whole Tor-
rent of Reproaches on me on this account. To vindicate my
self, I produced a Certificate under the Hands of Five Persons
who were present, and unanimously aver, That he did consent
to the burning of the said Papers. Besides these, there were
Three Church-men present; and had my Certificate been false,
I make no question but it would have been confronted by these
Gentlemen; but so far are they from giving their own Consci-
ences the Lye, that I am very well assured they have publicly
confessed, and some, or one of them to Mr. Agate's own Face,
That he did give his Consent to the destroying of the Papers.

MY Opponent not being able to produce any Counter-Evi-
dence, desires Satisfaction to some Scruples [p. 23.]. If the
Conference was to be burnt, why did we not mention this when
urged to subscribe? And why did I not publish this among my
other Reasons? [p. 24.] Why truly, in a word, 'twas be-
cause there were other Reasons which we thought sufficient to
determine us in our Resolution, not to comply with his New-
Invented Preliminaries, and those were published by me:
And Mr. Hallet affirms, He did mention this Agreement at the

very

very Conference. But by a strong Imagination, he makes me a Confuter of my own Friends: I have told the World, That *Mr. Hallet consented that the Scribes should preserve what they had written; and surely Burning and Preserving are not the same Things.* Had this Gentleman quoted my whole Sentence, there would have appeared not the least Pretence for a *Quibble*; for it's said in the adjoining Line, *That the Agreement was to burn the Papers, though Mr. Hallet made such an Offer.* But this is like the rest of his Conduct, and suitable to his usual Candour. My *Defence* takes Notice of two different Meetings; in the first 'twas agreed, the Papers should be burnt; in the second, (which was a Fortnight after) *Mr. Hallet*, that he might stop the Mouth of Defamation, receded from the first Agreement, and consented, *that the Papers should be preserved in the Scribes Hands.* And where is the Inconsistency of all this? That Eye must be tinged with Prejudice, and bleared with Envy, to a very great degree, that can espy a Contradiction in my Relation.

BEFORE I dismiss this Article, I cannot but take Notice of a most Unchristian Suggestion of my Opponent, when he tells the World [p. 23.], That *two of those Certifiers have had but Ill Luck at Swearing.*: By which the Reader, who knows not their Persons and Character, will be tempted to infer, that they have been guilty of *Perjury*, or some *inexcusable Rashness* in taking *Oaths*. I think my self, therefore, obliged to do them Justice, and to acquaint the World, that they have addressed themselves to *Mr. Agate*, desiring him to let them know, who are the Persons he intends; enforcing their Request with this Reason, That if he had been misinformed, they might vindicate themselves; but if they were guilty, they might make Satisfaction to the Person injured. But this Gentleman will by no means explain himself, but leaves us all in the dark; which gives Reason to conclude, That the whole is a *Hellish Insinuation*, contrived to make them Odious: And how Ill this becomes his Character as a *Christian*, or a *Minister*, I leave the World to judge. Seeing there can be no particular Defence against such a general Accusation, the Persons concerned have authorized me to tell him from the Press, That if by *Ill Luck at Swearing* he means that they have *Sworn Falsly*, he is challenged and desired to name the Persons; and that they all expect either that he *make good his Accusation*, or *publicly Recant so vile a Calumny*. This is no more than what a Just Concern for their own Credit and Reputation constrains them to.

Mr.

Mr. *Agate* having had such ill luck in accusing others, we are next to consider whether he has had any better in excusing of himself. He stands charg'd for saying, That the Dissenting Teachers take as much pains to DAMN Souls as Christ did to SAVE them; an Expression so injurious to the Honour of our *Saviour*, so full of Bitterness and Rancour against his fellow *Christians*, that no Words are capable of painting it out in more Odious Colours than it appears at first View. Amongst others, I produced the Testimony of Mr. *Michael Hyde*, one that has had as good an Education, and lives in as much Esteem as most *Citizens* in *Exon*; 'twas his Lot to be present at *Church* when this extravagant Expression dropt from the Preacher's Mouth. A little before our Conference, I accidentally met Mr. *Hyde* at a *Coffee-house*, and inquiring of him, whether he heard Mr. *Agate* deliver himself after that Wild manner in the Pulpit, he assured me that he did; and amongst other Discourse, (says he) He preached on these Words, *The fear of the Lord is the beginning of Wisdom, a good understanding have all they that do his Commandments*. When I came home I consulted my Concordance, and found these Words, *Psal. III. 10.* and in my Defence mentioned, this as the Text on which he Preached; whereas he really preach'd on *Job 28. 28. The fear of the Lord that is Wisdom, and to depart from Evil is Understanding*. Upon this Mr. *Agate* Triumphs, as if this inconsiderable mistake did Invalidate his whole Testimony: Whereas, should we allow his great a mistake in the Inferences as in the Text, the Sense will be found the same, though there may be some variation in the Words. But Mr. *Hyde* has Printed a Sheet of Paper in his own Vindication, and to bring the matter to an Issue, has publickly offered Mr. *Agate*, to refer himself to the Testimony of a Gentleman in his own Parish, one that is his constant Hearer, and goes to no Dissenting Meeting, to wait on him at any time with Mr. *Agate*, and stand or fall by his Testimony; Though this be a Proposal so exceeding fair and reasonable, Mr. *Agate* has not yet thought fit to accept it, and I believe it will be long enough before he will.

HAD not this Gentleman repeated his groundless Charge of Treason and Disloyalty against the *Dissenters*, I might have taken no further notice of his trampling on the Ashes of King *Williams*: But as long as he continues to throw his *Calves-Heads* in our Dishes, he must expect to hear of his own *Loyalty*, in insulting the memory of a *Prince* to whom he swore *Allegiance*,

ance; and of his SINCERITY too in praying for him whilst alive, That God would grant him in Health and Wealth long to live; and yet thank God for a mortal Disaster that befel him as soon as he was dead. The Expression which disgusted those who had a Veneration for the Memory of that deceased Heroe was this, *If King William had not dyed when he did, the present Queen must.* Now to put a tolerable colour upon so foul a matter, he shuffles, prevaricates, and contradicts himself in the grossest manner imaginable. The very day in which he preach'd after this mad rate, he denied to some Gentlemen, named in my last, not only his charging King William with such a Design as he now minces the matter, but he denied these very Words which he has since own'd, and would fain refer them, as he does Mr. Hyde, to his Notes. In his Reply, [p. 44.] he owns the Words, but positively affirms, *That though such a thing as a Design against the Princess was talked of at that time, yet (says he) my Expression was such, as manifestly shews I did not make it my own Sense, but rather implies my dislike of it.* In my Defence [p. 32.], I produc'd the Testimony of several Reputable Persons, who affirm, He was so far from manifesting his Dislike of this Malicious Tale, that he gave God Thanks that the Snare was broken, and she was escaped. The Horns of this Altar being broken, in his 2d Book he takes Sanctuary in an Explication as contrary to the former as the East is to the West. In his 1st Book he owns the Story to have Relation to King William, and therefore pretends to speak of it with dislike; But in his Plain Truth, he tells another Tale [p. 43.], 'Twas not King William, but the Factious Party that he spake of, that had a Design to defeat the Queen of her Crown and Life; and therefore Justifies his thanking God she had escaped their Hands. The Man is put to his Shifts, when he doubles, and prevaricates, and makes contradictory Excuses: Either he knew of such a Design carried on at that time, or not; If he did, he makes himself guilty of Misprision, by concealing it; If he did not, he acts the part of an Incendiary, by endeavouring to create Distrusts and Jealousies betwixt Her Majesty and Her good Subjects. But this pretended Plot is a Whimsy of his Tutor Lesly's, who discovers his Good-Will to the Queen, by refusing to Pray for, or Swear to Her Majesty. But there was, says this Gentleman, a Maxim laid down in a Pamphlet, Printed by an unknown Author, That the Children of a Tyrant ought to be laid aside, for Reasons of Eternal Force; Or, as in his first

Book the Words were more truly quoted, *All Free-born People have set aside the Children of Tyrants.* And are there not a couple of *Pretenders* on t'other side the Water, who are said to be the late King *James's* Children, whom the *Free-born People of England* have set aside, to the unspeakable Regret of Mr. Agate's dear Friend the *Rehearser*, and all his Party? But I hope the *Queen* sits never the less secure on Her Throne for this. The truth on't is, when this *Gentleman* told his Congregation, *That if King William had not died when he did, the present Queen must;* This necessarily supposes, that the said *King* had a Design upon her *Life*, or else his *Death* could have been no Security at all unto Her. Her *Life* was as much fenc'd and guarded by the *Law* when She was only Princess of *Denmark*, as since She has been *Queen of England.* It was *High Treason* to *Compass* or *Imagine* Her *Death* then, and it can be no more now. This is so evident, that M. Agate in his first Book declares, *He spake of this Report with dislike.* And though I have prov'd this to be an *absolute Falshood*, yet 'tis a plain Concession, that the Story it self had a *Malignant Aspect* on our late *Sovereign.* Why should he pretend to *dislike* it, but that he was *afraid*, or *asham'd*, to own it? Tho' this *Pulpit Rant* was most publick, 'twas not the only time in which he attempted to Murder the *Reputation* of our late *Glorious Monarch.* I can name the Place where he asserted, before a great Company, tho' not in the *Church*, yet just as he came out of it, *That King William came in a good Time, and went off in a good Time;* for if he had not *Dyed* as he did, the present *Queen* must. That Mr. Agate may not think I play at Bo-peep with him, as he does with us, if he has forgot this Discourse, (as probably he may, it being in all likelihood his usual Amusements) I will, whenever he demands, give him the *Gentleman's* Name from whom I received my Information, and the Place of his abode.

Mr. Agate, after *Rabby Lefly*, had affirmed in the *Pulpit*, *That in Cromwel's time the Sacrament was not once administered in the whole University of Oxford for 12 Years together.* He has own'd this to be a *mistake*, in his *Reply*; and I have prov'd it to be a most egregious *Falshood.* But this *Gentleman* will have it [p. 44, &c.] *That a High Contempt was cast upon the Sacrament, because the Vice-Chancellour, Doctors and Heads of Houses, did not all meet in a Body, and Receive the Sacrament at St. Mary's:* Though the *Liturgy* at this Day be not read unto them, when they meet there on *Sundays*

days to hear Sermons. But he says, *That there is a Statute which orders them, as a Body, to celebrate it several times a Year.* I have desired Mr. Agate to shew me such a Statute, and put the *Statutes of the University* into his Hands; But he was not able to produce me any such: And all the Satisfaction I could get was, That he had *received such an Information*, by I know not whom. This is indeed his usual Temper, to *Assert with the greatest Confidence* upon a bare *Hear-say*. As yet therefore, I suppose I may safely conclude, either that there was no such *Statute* as is pretended, or none but such as the *University* might dispence with if it thought fit.

THAT my *Antagonist* might gratify his Spleen by *Blackening the Dissenters*, he tells a Story in his first Book, of one employed to *Examine Men for the Sacrament* in *Exeter-Colledge*, who did use to *Commit Sodomy* with them. I proved, in my *Defence*, by the Testimony of living Witnesses, That the Person Examining Men for the *Sacrament* was Dr. Conant, at that Time *Rector* of the *Colledge*, and afterwards *Arch-Deacon* of *Norwich*. This was a Circumstance Mr. Agate did not think of, and spoiled his whole Design: And now truly, Dr. Conant was not the Man, but it was one of the *Fellows of the House*, and a *Clergy Man of this City* had the Story from Canon C--- [p. 46.]; the Name of this *Fellow* is, I suppose, industriously concealed, that we may not be able to trace out the *Calumny*, in order to detect it: However, there is a worthy *Clergy-man* still living, who was at that time *Fellow* of *Exeter-Colledge*, and an *Eminent Tutor*; I desired a Friend of mine to consult this Reverend Person about this Horrid Tale. He writes my Friend in these very Words: "I verily believe, and think, that neither he, (Dr. Conant) nor any other, that joyn'd in the Participation of the *Lords-Supper*, was so much as suspected to be guilty of so horrid a Wickedness as what you mention; nor did I ever hear that any One of that Society of Communicants, was ever charged with such Wickedness. (Concluding thus) I think it must be taken for a perfect Forgery, invented by one of the Children of him, who is the Father of Lies. There is also a *Gentlewoman* still living, who was a near Relation of the *Doctor's*, and managed his Domestick Affairs for him, who thus expresses herself in a Letter to my Friend: "He (i. e. Dr. Conant) did discourse those he did admit to the *Sacrament*, (I know he did me) and there were frequently some came to him in private;

“ but there was not any thing in the least to ground such a Report on, as ever I heard. I appeal to the Reason of Mankind, whether the *Testimony* of Living Persons, and such competent Judges, be not fully sufficient to shake the Foundation of a Story, that has nothing but an *uncertain Rumour*, or *Idle Tattle* to support it, if so much. That my *Opponent* may not say, that I shoot my Arrow in the dark, I am ready to name the *Gentleman* that gave me this Intelligence, to him or any other Friend he shall employ. What can the *Reader* think of these *Gentlemen*, who instead of *Evidence* and *Demonstration*, obtrude such *false, villainous, defamatory Tales* upon the World! Is this to act the part of *fair and honest Disputants*? Is this the way to *defend* their Cause, and gain *Proselytes*? Where is the *Wit*, the *Conscience*, or *Honour* of such a *Procedure*?

THE next thing to be considered is, I confess, a material Question, *viz.* Whether such as are Baptized by *Presbyterians* may be allowed to be *Christians*. I proved in my *Defence*, by many express Testimonies, that Mr. *Agate* had robbed us of our *Christianity*, set us upon the same Foot with *Infidels* and *Pagans*. And that his Proclamation from the *Pulpit*, That *Children Baptized by Dissenters are no more Christians than if Baptized by a Tradesman*, could have no other meaning, than that they were no Christians at all. In debating this Matter, I know not whereto find my Adversary; sometimes such a Baptism is *thought to be valid*, and the Church does not think fit to repeat it. Sometimes such are allowed to be *Christians*; and so are those that are Baptized by *Midwives* and *Laymen*: These were some of his Concessions in his former Book. But now he tells us, He had no Authority for it, either from the Holy Scriptures or the Sense of the *Catholick Church* [p. 49.]. It makes me smile to hear this *Gentleman* talk as confidently of the Sense of the *Catholick Church* for 1500 or 1600 Years together, as if he had been Secretary to all the General Councils in that Time; while he, poor Man, knows very little of the History of his own Church, as will be made appear in the sequel of this Discourse.

BUT to let the World see that he does not use to persist long in a good Humour, he retracts what he calls a *Concession* of *Charity*, and now the *Persons baptized by Dissenting Teachers, are not so much Christians as those baptized by a Lay-Churchman*; because *Schismatical Baptism has been looked upon by several of the ancient Fathers and Councils as no Baptism*

Baptism at all; for which he quotes *St. Cyprian, &c.* But if this *Gentleman* be so well acquainted with *Antiquity*, as he pretends, he must know, that though *Cyprian* and some other *African Bishops*, declared the *Baptism* of *Hereticks* to be null and invalid; yet this Conceit of his was disowned by most other Churches, and he himself was for this very cause Excommunicated by *Pope Stephen*, who, like *Mr. Agate*, was a *High-Churchman*, and an Enemy to *Moderation*, Name and Thing. However, they that condemn the *Violence* and *Fierceness* of his Temper, yet own the *Orthodoxy* of his Judgment in this particular.

BEFORE I dismiss this Notion of *Mr. Agate's*, I would very willingly be resolved in this one Question; If a *Schismatical Baptism* be no *Baptism*, as he insinuates [p. 49.]; how comes the Church of *Rome* to be a True Part of the *Catholic Church*, as he confesses it to be? [p. 116.] There is a notorious great *Schism* between the Church of *Rome* and the Church of *England*, and therefore one of these two Churches must be *Schismatical*. I hope he will acquit his own Church of so heinous a Crime, and lay this ugly Brat at her Door, who is the Mother of all Abominations. But then, if the *Baptism* of *Schismatics* be good for nothing, how came the Sacraments on the other side the Water to be *Valid* and *Authentick*? Or, how came our first Reformers by their *Christianity*, who were Baptized in the *Roman, i. e. a Schismatical Church*? I know not how *Mr. Agate* can reconcile these Conceits of his, but only this oneway, that he has some *Concessions of Charity* for a *Papist*, but none for a *Dissenter*.

UNDER this Head, we are blest with a Discovery that sounds a little odd in the Mouth of one that calls himself a *Protestant* [p. 50.]; If Persons baptized by *Schismatics* be any time allowed to be *Christians*, this is purely by the Dispensation of the Church. When this *Gentleman* is at leisure, I would gladly be informed, In what Hands this *Dispensing Church Power* is lodged? When *K. James* claimed a *Dispensing Power*, 'twas urged, by the greatest Lawyers in the Kingdom, That a Suspending the Laws, was a temporary Abrogation of them; and that this could be done by no Power less than that which gave them their Sanction, and very Being. This in the *Bishops Case* was thought good Law, and good Reason; and I can see no Cause why it should not hold good in the Church, as well as in the State. If the Church can allow those to be *Christians*, which according to the Constitution

tion of the *Gospel*, are really *none* ; if it can *Dispense* with the *Laws of Christ*, by the very same *Power* it may *vacate* and *destroy* them : So that if this *Doctrine* prevails, we must throw aside the *Bible* and *Ten Commandments*, and study the *Book of Canons*. I know the *Pope* pretends to such a *Dispensing Power*, and grants his *Bulls* with a *Non Obstante* to the *Institutions of Christ* and His *Apostles* ; and I perceive a *High-Flyer* is one, that with a winged speed is gliding towards the *Holy See*.

AFTER all that has been said on this Head, I have to do with such a *flirting Adversary*, that I know not where to find him. Sometimes such as have had but a *Presbyterian Baptism*, are allowed to be *Christians*, as in the Case of *K. William*; and many others who are admitted to the *Sacrament* in our publick Churches, without being ever Re-baptized. So great is the Force of *Truth*, that it sometimes *extorts* such a Confession from him ; at other times, his Fiery Principles prevail, and his Natural Choler has the ascendant over him, and presently these plausible Concessions are all retracted. Thus he boldly publishes to the World [p. 53.], *That 'till I have proved, that the Dissenting Teachers are rightly Ordained*, (which he presumes a Thing impossible) *he will be contented to think the Children they Baptize are no Christians*. Were he contented to keep his Whimfies to himself, he might ride his own *Hobby Horse* for me ; but since he endeavours to infuse his Malignity into the Minds of others, to inflame Mens Prejudices, and heighten their Animosities by such an *uncharitable Suggestion* ; I think my self therefore obliged, to Hint a little at those many *desperate Consequences* which necessarily flow from this *dividing Principle*.

IF such as have only a *Presbyterian Baptism* be no Christians, as he insinuates both from the *Pulpit*, *Press*, and in his *private Conversation*, 'twill follow, that all the Protestant Churches beyond the Seas are nothing else but so many *Pagan Clubs*, or *Heathenish Cabals* ; and that our Eminent *Divines*, Famous *Bishops* and *Convocations*, who have owned them as *Sister Churches*, were either grossly *Ignorant*, in that they knew not what was Essential to a Church ; or *wilely Hypocritical*, in Complementing those as *such*, whom they in their Consciences believed to be *none*. Nay, many of those amongst us, who have enroll'd themselves in the *High-flying Squadron*, and put a mighty Value upon themselves in being *True Sons* of the Church, will be found, upon Enquiry, to be of no Church

Church at all. Such, for instance, as being Born in the Days of *Cromwel*, or the *Long Parliament*, had no other than a *Presbyterian Baptism*; with those who are since sprung from the Loins of Dissenting Parents; and conceive they can no other way atone for their Original Guilt, but by an *excessive* Heat and Warmth in the New Cause they have espoused. Nay, there are many of the Clergy, who are this Day serving at the *Altar*, who had their Birth and Education amongst *Dissenters*, or were Initiated into the Church before *K. Charles's Restoration*. Now all these, according to *Mr. Agate's Scheme*, are *no Christians*; they have none of the *Immortalizing Spirit* which a MIGHTY DON of the PARTY has lately discovered, and which only distils through a *Bishop's Fingers*. Hence it will necessarily follow, that their Administrations are all *null and void*. How can they confer *Baptism* on others, who have no *valid Baptism* themselves? Or how can they that are *without* the Church, admit others *into it*? Should this *Doctrine* prevail, it involves Men in these Perplexities, out of which they can never extricate themselves.

I may add, if the Principles laid down in the *Pamphlet* before me be true, no Clergyman in *England* can be certain he has a *Lawful Commission* to Exercise that *Sacred Function*, which he pretends unto; nor can any other Person be secure of his *very Christianity*. 'Tis the avowed Principle of *Mr. Agate*, That *Presbyterian Ordination is null and invalid*; That *where there are no Priests, there be no Sacraments*; And [p. 53.] *they that are not Baptized are no Christians*. He confesses further [p. 139.], *That in the Church of Rome, Presbyters have been allowed to Ordain; and that their Ordinary Priests have been Licensed to do the most Essential Offices of a Bishop, by a Faculty from the Pope's inexhaustible Power*. 'Tis very well known, that in former Ages, the Kingdom of *England* was as much *Pope-ridden* as any Nation in the World. *Mr. Agate* has been Ordained by a *Bishop*, and takes it for granted, that this *Bishop* was Ordained by another, and he by a third; and so in a constant Line of Succession up to the *Apostles* themselves: But what Assurance has he, that some of those very Persons from whom he derives, did not receive their *Ordination* from those *Meer Priests*, whom the *Pope* had Licensed to Invade the *Bishop's Office*? If there be but one such Instance, (as there may be many) all the Ordinations that have succeeded must be of no force at all; if one Link be broken, the whole Chain is useless. If there be but one Ob-

struction

struction in this *Ecclesiastical Conduit-Pipe*, the whole Stream of Church Power (according to this Scheme) is totally diverted. The Church of *England* was once a *Daughter-Church* to that of *Rome*, and there he affirms *Presbyters* are allowed to Ordain. If this be the Case but of one of all his Spiritual *Fathers*, from that *Bishop* that laid Hands on him up to the very *Apostles*, he is himself as much a Lay-man as any Dissenter of us all, and his *Administrations* all null and void. Thus by laying down these *Schismatical Positions*, he undermines the Foundation of his own Church, and lops off that very Bough on which he perches, and from whence he looks down with such Contempt and Scorn on his *Dissenting Brethren*.

IF *Presbyterians* are no *Christians*, I demanded, how King *William*, who was Baptized amongst them, could be Head of the Church of *England*? To this Mr. *Agate* answers, [p. 55, &c.] *Whether a Man be a Christian or no Christian, he may do well enough for the Head of the Church: That the Primitive Christians were subject to Heathen Emperors, &c.* But this is to shuffle and evade, and not answer the Objection. I urged, That according to the *Articles* and *Canons*, and the Oath which all the *Clergy* took, the King of *England* is declared to be *Supream Governour*, not only over *Ecclesiastical Persons*, (as the *Mogul* or *Turk* may be) but also in all *Ecclesiastical THINGS* and *CAUSES*. And the difficulty is, how one who is out of the Church can be *Supream* in Church Matters, in *Sacred* as well as *Civil Causes*. This is a Bone too hard for him to fix his angry Fangs in, and therefore he throws it away.

I demanded further, How King *Charles* could be a Martyr if Baptized by a *Presbyterian*, and so no *Christian*? The Reason of my supposition is this; That Prince was Born and Baptized in *Scotland*, when the *Presbyterian* was the Church Government by Law established in that Kingdom; and though *Episcopacy* was restored in a few Years afterwards, yet the first *Bishops* had no other than *Presbyterian* Ordination, [Def. p. 47, &c.] To this Mr. *Agate* Replies, [p. 57.] *It is more than probable that David Lindsey, Bishop of Ross and Minister of Leith, Baptized him.* To support his Assertion, he quotes *Spotswood*, p. 406, 453, 520. What that Historian affirms in the places cited, amounts to thus much: In 1594, Mr. *Lindsey* was present at the Baptism of Prince *Henry*, but the Office was performed by another. In 1598, King *James* had a *Daughter* born, and baptized by Mr. *David Lindsey*, Minister of *Leith*. In 1600, Prince *Charles* was born, but it is not left

left upon Record by whom he was Baptized. In 1613, Mr. *Lindsey* departed this Life, being *Bishop of Ross*. It is no necessary Consequence, that this Divine must Baptize King *Charles* because he performed that Office for his Sister : But supposing this was the very Man from whom King *Charles* received his Baptism ; the Scottish Historians put it out of all Dispute, that he was not Bishop of *Ross* at the Birth of that Prince, though he died Invested with that Character 12 Years afterwards. In the Year 1598, there was a General Assembly of the Church of *Scotland* at *Dundee*, the chief End whereof was to obtain the consent of the Assembly, for some of the most Eminent Ministers to Vote in *Parliament* : This Motion was warmly opposed by those, who thought this would be a Stirrup for the *Bishops* to mount the Saddle ; to which Order they had a vehement Aversion : Upon which Account, King *James* came in Person, and made an Harangue to the Assembly, telling them, *That this was the way to Vindicate the Kirk from Poverty and Contempt. I mind nat* (says he) *to bring in Papistical or Anglicane Bishops, but only to have the best and wisest of the Ministry, appointed by the General Assembly, to have place in Council and Parliament* *. Mr. *Lindsey* was one of the Commissioners, and some of them made the same Protestation. So that as yet there was no such Thing as an *Anglicane* or *English Bishop*.

IN 1600, the Year of King *Charles's* Birth, there was a General Assembly at *Montross*, in which 'twas agreed, that some select Ministers should Vote in *Parliament* ; but then 'twas specially provided, that the Person enjoying this Honour should only be called the *Commissioner* of such a place, and that he should be subject to the Tryal and Censure of his own Presbytery † ; with other severe Restrictions, which are wholly inconsistent with the *Prelatical Dignity*.

IN 1602, there was another General Assembly at *Halyrud-House*, in which Commissioners were appointed, to inspect the Lives of other Ministers within such or such a District, and to be Responsible to the next Assembly. Amongst others, Mr. *David Lindsey* is nominated Commissioner for *Ross* † ; but as yet here was no new Consecration, nor can he be called a *Bishop* ; for never was it yet known, that one of that Character would

D

take

* *Calderwoods Hist. of the Ch. of Scotland*, p. 418. † *Ib.* p. 440, 441. † *Ib.* 460.

take a Commission from *Meer Presbyters*, to visit his own *Diocess*, or that he was accountable unto them.

IN 1603, King *James* succeeded Queen *Elizabeth* to the Crown of *England*.

IN 1604, this Mr. *Lindsey* came from Court, Bishop of *Ross* *; and he, with others, are by the Historian called *new made Bishops* †, who affirms, *That some of the Ministers appointed at the General Assembly in 1602, (the last before the King's departure out of the Country) were preferred since that time to Bishopricks* ‖. So that Mr. *Lindsey's* Advancement to a *Bishoprick* was since 1602, whereas K. *Charles* was Baptized Two Years before.

BUT Mr. Ag. says [p. 57.], *The Dissenters gave him a Baptism in 48, sufficient to make him a Martyr and a Christian too*. If so, that Prince was more obliged to *Cromwel* than tis generally supposed he was; his cruel Kindness belike made him a Christian; and had it not been for *Oliver*, and his *High-Court of Justice*, instead of *interceding* for us at the Right-Hand of GOD, he might have been disposed of with *Seneca*, *Cato*, and other *Moral Heathens*.

UNDER this Head, we are blessed with a Discovery that sounds a little Harsh in Protestant Ears: *As his Majesty pray'd for his Enemies on the Scaffold* [p. 58.], so it is very likely he prays still for the Conversion of all those that inherit their Principles, and act his Murder over every Year in Effigie. This is a Doctrine to be met with in the *Mafs-Book*; but the *Homilies* of the Church of *England* do utterly disown it, and thus expresse that Churches Sense ‡: "If Answer be made, " that they (the *Papists*) make Saints but *Intercessors* to GOD, " and Means for such Things as they would obtain of GOD, " that is even after the *Gentiles* Idolatrous Usage, &c. This is the Sense of the *English Church*: But our Author has had some *Lucky Hits* which the *Sages* of the former Century knew nothing of. If King *Charles* prays for those that act his Murder every Year, he must know that there are such; But how comes he by the Knowledge of what is pretended to be done in very many and distant places at the same time? Does not this suppose him to be Omniscient, and rather Deify than Canonize

* *Calderwoods Hist.* p. 478. † *Ib.* 479. ‖ *Ib.* p. 578.
‡ *Homily against Peril of Idolatry*, pt. 3. p. 235.

nonize him? The Prophet *Isaiah* addressees himself in these words to the *Almighty*, ch. 63. 16. *Doubtless thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not.* We will suppose King *Charles* to be a Bright and Shining Saint; But is he greater than our Father *Abraham*? If these Renowned Patriarchs were ignorant of the Affairs of their own Posterity, how came King *Charles* to be so well acquainted with the Cabals of his avowed Enemies? If the Saints pray for us, why may not we, with the *Papists*, desire their Prayers? This being the very Thing they ground their *Invocation of Saints and Angels* on. I am thinking, how prettily a *Holy Charles* pray for us would sound in our *Litany*. If ever our *Author* goes a *Jesuite* Hunting a 2d time, I would advise him to let alone the *Conventicle*, and look in his own *Glass*, where he may see more of the Lineaments and Features of a *Son of Loyala*, than amongst 500 *Dissenters*.

I demanded further, *If Persons baptized by Presbyterians be no Christians, why such are buried in sure and certain Hope of their Resurrection to Eternal Life?* I argued, That my *Antagonist* had no just Cause to Clamour with me for changing [*he*] into [*Their*]; because 'tis positively affirmed of every Person that is buried, according to the *English Liturgy*, that *GOD* has taken to himself his or her *Soul* in great *Mercy*: And therefore, that the *Body* belonging to such a *Soul* must be supposed to rise again in a State of *Bliss* and *Glory*. This was my Argument, which *Mr. Agate* makes no Reply unto, only that the *Expression* is *defensible*, but condescends not to tell us how; but pretends, That if it were not for the *obdurate Temper of the Dissenters*, the *Ancient Discipline of the Church* might be restored, and *Notorious Offenders excommunicated*, [p. 62.] Were these *Dissenters* all Knock'd o'th' Head, no doubt but we should see a Blessed Reformation! I hope that *Glorious MARTYR Arch-Bishop Laud* will be allowed to be a severe Asserter of *Ecclesiastical Discipline*; there were very few of these *Obstinate Fanaticks* to stand in his Way: And how Things were managed whilst he sat at the *Helm*, I shall represent unto the *Reader*, not in the Words of a *Traytor*, or a *sullen Malecontent*, but in the Words of the Eloquent and Noble Lord *Falkland*, who sealed his *Loyalty* with his *Blood*, and Died fighting under the *Royal Banner*, who thus expresses himself*: " Nay, it hath been more dangerous for Men to go
" to

* *Nalsons Collections*, Vol. I. p. 768.

“ to some Neighbours Parish, when they had no Sermon in
 “ their own, than to be obstinate and perpetual Recusants,
 “ While *Masses* have been said in Security, a *Conventicle* hath
 “ been a Crime; and which is yet more, the Conforming to
 “ *Ceremonies* hath been more exacted than the Conforming to
 “ *Christianity*; and whilst Men for *Scruples* have been Un-
 “ done, for Attempts upon *Sodomy* they have only been Ad-
 “ monished. This was the *Discipline* in fashion when *High-
 Church* was Triumphant; and the same Effects are most likely
 to flow from the same Cause.

I affirmed in my *Defence*, That our *Meetings* are not *Con-
 venticles*, because allowed by the *Law* of the *Land*; where-
 as the 11th *Canon* defines *Conventicles* to be other *Congrega-
 tions* than by the *Laws* of the *Land* are held and allowed. To
 this Mr. *Agate* objects, That the *Toleration Act* is no Allow-
 ance. All that I desire is, that the *Act* may speak for it self,
 and that the *Reader* will believe his own Eyes; the very word
Allowed is more than once mentioned in it, as applied to our
Assemblies. But it is a usual Thing for this *Gentleman* to
 obtrude his Wild Conjectures, or Idle Hear-says, upon the
 World, with the most solemn Asseveration.

We are now come to one of the main *Articles* of Mr. *A-
 gate's* Book, and that is, His Charge of *Jesuitism* against the
Dissenters: This, I confess, is a novel *Accusation*, and it is
 pity but he should have the Glory of the *Invention*. It has
 been affirmed by many, That the *Jesuites* and *Puritans* are
 the *Two Extreams*, who widen the Difference betwixt the *Pro-
 testant* and *Popish Churches*. But all on a suddain, Mr. *Agate*
 has made them shake Hands, and brought the two Poles toge-
 ther. His *Friend* at *Plymouth* has furnished him with abun-
 dance of *STORIES*, on which I am obliged to make a few
Reflections.

1. I Remark, that though the *Dissenters* have had their
Meetings open, and publick, for these Twenty Years last past;
 yet, in all that time, he has not been able to give One Instance
 of a *Jesuite*, or *Priest*, who has been allowed to preach amongst
 them. He affirms, indeed, [p. 63.] with his usual Confidence,
 That the *Dissenters* are the greatest Promoters of Popery, and
 the *Jesuites* and *Romish Emissaries* are used to preach and
 pray amongst them in their *Conventicles*. Again [p. 68.], he
 tells the World, That it is a very common Thing for these *E-
 missaries* to preach and pray in their *Conventicles*. His *Accu-
 sation*

sation speaks of the *present Time*, but his *Proofs* refer to what was done 100 or 150 Years ago. He arraigns the *present* Generation of *Dissenters*, but his Evidence speaks only of their *Forefathers*. Should I affirm, That tis a *common Thing* for *Popish Priests* to preach in the publick Churches of this City, and pretend to prove it, because one *Courtney* commonly did so about 30 Years ago; How would Mr. *Agate* Exclaim against me for such an unjust Representation of Affairs? Must I be guilty of such or such a Crime, because my Father was condemned for it? Suppose all the *Tales* he has collected be true, is it a necessary Consequence, that because some *Priests* crept in amongst the *Puritans* in the Days of Qu. *Elizabeth*, that therefore they are *used to preach and pray* amongst them in the *Reign* of Qu. *ANNE*? When he so positively and confidently Accuses the present *Dissenters*, and can prove nothing at all against them, but only against such as are *dead and rotten*, I leave the World to judge, Whether in this he argues as a *Logician*, a *good Christian*, or an *Honest Man*.

2. I desire the *Reader* to consider, that many of the Stories related by him, are absolutely *False in Matter of Fact*; and that many of the Citations he produces are perfect *Forgeries*. When he meets with a *Tale*, tis usual for him to make Additions of his own, without any Authority from his *Author*. Thus he pretends to give us the Substance of several *Popes Bulls*, wherein the *Roman Emissaries* are directed how to manage their Affairs in *England* [p. 68, 69.]. But in this *Harangue* we are presented with, there are several particulars which are the pure *Figments* of his own Brain. He pretends, *They had Instruction to cry up Extempore Prayer*; and to make People believe, *That our Common-Prayer was the Romanish Mass translated*, for which he refers us, to *Foxes and Firebrands*, Part 2d, p. 20, 28, 31, 32, 52. whereas in the places mentioned by him, there is not one such Word to be found. But in this *Papal Dispensation*, I find this Expression; *Some of you (i. e. Emissaries) who undertook to be of this sort of the Heretical Episcopal Society, bring it as near the Mother Church as you can* *. When therefore I hear a *Preacher* tell the World, That the *Saints in Heaven pray for us*; That *Christs Body is really in the Sacrament*; That the Church of Rome

* *Foxes and Firebrands*, pt. 2d, p. 31.

Rome is a true Church, but that the Protestants beyond the Seas have no such Thing as Priests or Sacraments; Have I not Reason to suspect that this is a Jesuite in Masquerade, and has received Instructions from the Pope, to bring the English as near the Mother Church as he is able? I am content the Reader shall be Judge, Whether this Gentleman argues like a Master of Arts, when he pretends to prove the Dissenters Jesuites, because that Gang of Men were directed by their Holy Father, to Herd themselves amongst the Heretical, Episcopal Society.

I come now to consider some of those many Tales which have been obtruded upon the Credulity of Mankind, and shall begin with that of Faithful Cummin, which Mr. Agate pretends to be Attested by Registers and Publick Records. But this is more than the first Publisher affirms; this Story is only said to be an Extract out of the Memorials of my Lord Cecil; that it came into the Hands of Arch-Bishop Usher; that from him it was transmitted (no body knows how) to Sir James Ware: And Dr. Nalson tells us*, that it was by a third Person communicated to him, from Robert Ware Esq; Son to the said Sir James. But he has not thought fit to let us know these two Persons who were concerned in the Conveyance, what Character they bear, or what Credit they deserve. However, Mr. Agate fancies, that the Credibility of the Story is sufficiently supported by the Reputation of the Publisher; it is the famous Dr. above mentioned, whose Enemies have not been able to detect him in any one thing that is false [p. 65.]. The Reader may guess a little better at the Character of this Gentleman by the following Account †. On March 21st 1708, one Jonathan Edwin was sent for by the House of Commons, to give an Account, by what Authority he published a Pamphlet, Intituled, *A Letter from a Jesuite in Paris, to his Correspondent in London, &c.* March 26. the House was informed, that Dr. John Nelson was the Author of the said Pamphlet, for which he was sent for in Custody of the Serjeant at Arms. April 10. 1679, a Petition was presented to the House from John Nelson, Dr. of Law, begging Pardon of that Honourable House, and praying to be discharged. May 21st, the House Ordered His

* Introduction to Hist. Collect. p. 38. † Vid. Journals of the House of Commons, printed 1680.

His Majesty to be Addressed, That the said Dr. may be put out of the Commission of the Peace. *May 2d*, having received a Reprimand upon his Knees from Mr. Speaker, he was discharged, paying his Fees. Is this *Mr. Agates Impartial, Famous, and Ingenious Author*? Is this the Gentleman who trump up the Story of *Faithful Cummin*, one that did Penance at the Bar of the House of Commons, for a Forgery of like Nature? Whoever will peruse the Remarks made upon this Tale, in the *Answer to Dr. Scots Case about Forms of Prayer*, will find that it looks with as Romantick an Air as can be well supposed. I shall only mention two Circumstances, and let the Reader judge for himself.

IN the beginning of this Relation, tis said, 'That this *Cummin* was detected in the Year 1567, being the 9th of Qu. *Elizabeth* †. In the latter end of it tis said ‡, That though he made his escape, yet this Affair produced the Act for the preventing Popery, and other Sects, which enjoyned all People, from Ten Years old and upwards, not having a Lawful Impediment, to repair every *Sunday* to hear Divine Service, under Penalty of forfeiting 12 *d.* for every such Default. Whereas, in Truth, there never was any Act, taking notice of Persons of 10 Years old; and the Statute obliging Persons to repair to their Parish Churches, on Penalty of 12 *d.* for every *Sunday* they shall be absent, was Enacted in the 1st Year of that Queen. Thus the Head and Tail of this Story are perfect Contradictions to one another, and the Effect is made to Exist 8 Years before its proper Cause. I appeal to all those who have read our English *Histories*, whether there be the least shadow of a probability, that such a Wild and Incoherent Blunder should be ever found amongst the Papers of so Great and Wise a Man as Secretary Cecil.

THERE is one Circumstance more which shakes the Credibility of this Tale. *Cummin* was Ordained by Cardinal Pole, sometime Arch-Bishop of Canterbury *, yet John Clarkson, Chaplain to Arch-Bishop Parker, is pretended to begin his Accusation of him before the Council in these Words, Let him prove his Ordination, since he fell from the Church of Rome †. Nay, the Romance introduces Queen Elizabeth speaking these Words to him: *Mr. Cummin, if you will receive*

‡ *Foxes and Firebrands*, p. 14. † *lb.* p. 29. * *lb.* p. 18.
† *lb.* p. 17.

ceive Orders, and become of the Church of England you may, otherwise you must not be permitted to Pray and Preach among my Subjects ||. But to what end should he be urged to receive Orders a Second time, when he had already an Ordination as Valid and Authentick as any of our first Reformers could pretend unto? There are in England 10000 Clergymen, and of all those there were not † 200 deprived of their Benefices at the Reformation of Religion; all the rest kept their Places, without repeating those Orders which they received from Popish Bishops. And can it be supposed that Q. Elizabeth, and Arch-Bishop Parker's Chaplain, should so little understand the Constitution of their own Church, as to exact a Re-ordination from this Cummin, when he was sufficiently Ordained before, and there were so many Thousand others in the same Circumstances? Whoever can digest such strange Improbabilities, I must needs say, *great is his Faith.*

IN my Defence, I took notice of another Story, related by the same Author with that of Faithful Cummins, to this effect: That there was one Nowland, a Dominican Fryer, who came to Plymouth, and served Mr. Hughs, an Independent Preacher, first as an Under-Gardiner, next as Head-Gardiner, from whence he was advanced to be his Butler, and at last was admitted to Pray and Expound before the Elders, and others of his Flock. I objected against this Tale, That Mr. Hughs went not under the Character of an Independent, and that two Gardiners, a Butler, and other Servants, was an Equipage fitter for an Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, than the Vicar of St. Andrews.

TO this Mr. Agate answers, That Dr. Nalson, who wrote the first Part of Foxes and Firebrands, was not the Author of the second Part, where we find this Story of Nowland: But in this he is greatly mistaken, for the Author of the Second part expressly affirms, That he was the Man who gave us a Narrative of Faithful Cummin [p. 14.] However, to satisfy the World, he produces the Certificate of one Mr. Young, a Surgeon in Plymouth, whom Mr. Agate has dubbed, *A very Worthy and Learned Doctor*, which runs in these words [p. 66.] *That which the Author of the Foxes and Firebrands writes of Mr Hughs is very true, and all that Mr W. says of him is* very

|| Foxes and Firebrands, p. 23. † Fullers Church Hist. L. 2. p. 59.

very False: Mr. Hughes had Garden enough to employ two Men, and a Cellar big enough for a Butler. He lived at that time in greater Credit, Power and Equipage, than any Arch-bishop in the Three Kingdoms, almost in as much State and Grandeur as our Arch-bishops do now. And having affirmed Mr. Hughes to be an Independent, the Doctor goes on: As to Nowland, the Dominican Friar, the Story is true to my certain Knowledge; I knew the Man; he absconded at the Restoration, and returned to his own Country, and there made a Narrative of his Intrigues to Mr. Muschamp.

WHEN I first saw this Certificate, methought it looked with a strange *Romantick Air*; and there being a couple of Ancient Gentlewomen who were Mr. Hughes Sisters-in-Law, my near Neighbours, I shew'd it to them, who affirmed the whole to be an absolute Falshood. This encouraged me to make a more exact Enquiry; and it being a Question, whether the Learned Doctor was of a Deposing Age at the Time referred to, I desired a Friend of mine to examine the *Parish Records*; which accordingly he did, by whom I am informed, That this Gentleman was Born, or Baptized, March 11. 1646, which is the very Latter End of that Year: King Charles was Restored in May, 1660; so that at that time he was about 2 Months upwards of Thirteen Years old. And I appeal to the common Experience of Mankind, whether it be not a Thing very unusual, for a Lad of that Age to observe the Concerns of other Mens Families so nicely, as to give such an *exact and punctual Relation* of them 48 Years afterwards. And that this Gentleman labours under a very great Mistake, I am assured by those who are far more competent Judges than he can pretend to be of this Matter, who have subscribed as follows:

Agnes Lampen, about 80 Years of Age, affirms:

That she lived a Servant with Mr. George Hughes, Minister of Plymouth, at least 3 or 4 Years before he was turned out of the publick Churches: That all that time he kept neither Gardener nor Butler in his Family: That he had but one Servant Man, whose Name was Alexander Hughes*, and

* This Mr. Alexander Hughes kept afterwards a *Mercers Shop*, and lived in good Reputation at Dartmouth. He died there about 7 or 8 Years since; I knew him very well, and have often heard him own his former Relation to Mr. G. Hughes Family.

and that no such Man as *Nowland* lived with him.

The mark of *Agnes Lampen.*

Signed in the presence of

Ser. Savery.

Mrs. Philippa Thomas, (whose Sister was *Mr. Hughs Wife*)
Aged about 78, affirms:

THAT she lived 5 or 6 Years at least with her Brother *Hughs* in *Plymouth*: That she was there when the above-named *Agnes* was a Servant in his Family: That he kept neither *Gardener* nor *Butler*, nor above one Man Servant at a time: That *Alexander Hughs* was a Servant to him, but as for *Nowland*, she never heard his Name 'till *Mr. Agate's Book* was printed.

Phil. Thomas.

Rose Jefferys, Aged 72, affirms:

THAT she lived Half a Year in *Mr. G. Hughs* Family, and was a constant Retainer to his House several Years after, till his Ejection and Imprisonment: That *Mr. Hughs* kept neither *Butler* nor *Gardener*, and but one Servant Man, whose Name was *Alexander Hughs*, and before him one *Degory Hawkins*, who died in *Plymouth*: That when her Master had Occasion for Work to be done in his Garden, he employ'd one *Daniel Cawl*, a publick Gardener in the Town.

The mark of *Rose Jefferys.*

Signed in the presence of

Ser. Savery.

Mrs. Mercy Searl, whose Husband's Brother married *Mr. Hughs* Daughter, affirms:

THAT she was intimately acquainted with *Mr. G. Hughs*, and the Concerns of his Family: That she never knew him keep a *Butler* or *Gardener*, or more than one Man Servant at a time: That she was in Communion with him more than 50 Years since, and never knew such a man as *Nowland* pray before the Society.

Mercy Searl.

THERE

THERE be several other persons of Age and Reputation, as Mr. *Nath. Northcot*, Mrs. *Horn*, another of Mr. *Hughs* Sisters, Mrs. *Draper*, whose Father first entertained Mr. *Hughs* when he came into *Devon*, & who was particularly acquainted with him whilst Minister in *Plymouth*; who all concur, they knew no such man as *Nowland*, Servant to Mr. *Hughs*, as is pretended. I appeal to the Reader, whether all these persons, who Lived in Mr. *Hughs* Family, were nearly Related to it, or particularly Acquainted with the Concerns thereof, do not deserve more Credit than one who was at that time a puny School-Boy, and no way at all Related to it.

WERE there no Counter-Evidence, this Certificate carries its own Confutation. The Doctor affirms, Mr. *Hughs* had Garden enough to employ two Men. This very Garden is now in the possession of Mr. *Phil. Pentyre*, who bought it of Mr. *Obadiah*, Son to Mr. *George Hughs*; being t'other Day at *Plymouth*, I desired the Keys, and in company with some other Friends we took the Dimensions of this Garden, by running a Line from Wall to Wall; we made it about 106 Feet long, and 82 Feet broad. 'Tis true, there be two little Gardens just by the Dwelling-House, but one of these was made since Mr. *Hughs* left the Town: However, 'tis owned by the persons above-named, That he had one little Garden besides the larger One already described, and no more. I had not an opportunity of getting into this Garden; but one of the Walls being next the Street, I measured it with my Cane, as did a Gentleman in my company, and we made it about 45 Feet, and were told, That the whole was a little square Plot. If the Reader pleases to compute, how many square Feet there be in an Acre of Land, & how many square Feet there be in two Gardens of these Dimensions, he will find, that they will not both make a Quarter of an Acre. And whether this be a Plot big enough to employ two Men, I must appeal from the Certificate of this Learned Doctor, to the common Sense and Reason of Mankind.

THIS Certifier affirms further, That Mr. *Hughs* had a Cellar big enough for a Butler, and that he lived in almost as much State and Grandeur as our Arch-bishops do now. That we may make some Guess at the Truth of this, we must enquire, What means he had to support this pretended Grandeur; for 'tis certain, the Spring cannot rise higher than the Fountain, nor the State of an Arch-bishop be maintained without a proportionable Fund. I am assured by his Sisters, That he had no Temporal Estate, nothing but his Ecclesiastical Re-

venues to keep up this mighty Splendor. I consulted the ^{the} Valuation of Church-Livings, as Rated in the QUEEN's Books, and the case thus stands * :

	l.	s.	d.
Arch-bishoprick of Canterbury, rated at-----	4233	18	8
V. Plimouth cum Capp. ff. Budos & Pancratii-----	25	10	9

'Tis true, since this Rate was made, as money is more plentiful, so the Value of all Estates is considerably raised ; and this Town is much increased, both in its Riches and the Number of its Inhabitants : But we may as well suppose that a Frog can swell to the Dimensions of an Ox, as that the Vicaridge of St. Andrews should bear any Proportion to an Arch-bishoprick.

'Tis confessed, that as Mr. Hughs married a Daughter of----- Upton, Friends with great Generosity and Freedom, of Lupton Esq; and was highly respected both by the Country Gentlemen and Magistrates of the Town.

But there were other Ministers to be maintained as well as Mr. Hughs, particularly Mr. Martin, his Brother-in-Law and Assistant ; and another at the New Church. I appeal to all the World, Whether it be possible for a Gentleman, upon an Estate of between Two and Three Hundred Pounds per Annum, (which is the most Mr. Hughs could pretend to, all the Perquisites included, as his Wife's Sisters have assured me) to live in almost as much Grandeur as an Arch-bishop, who has 15 or 20 times as much.

WHEN I considered all these Circumstances, I could hardly believe, that a Man of Sense would CERTIFY after this Wild Rate ! Being therefore in Plymouth, I waited on the Doctor, in company with a Gentleman of Quality : He own'd to us, That he could not say, whether Nowland was a Butler or Gardener to Mr. Hughs ; but this is what the Author of Foxes and Firebrands positively affirms ; & the very Circumstance against which I object : And the Doctor certifies, That what that Author writes of Mr. Hughs is Very True, and all that Mr. W. says of him is Very False ; And that the Story of Nowland is true to his certain Knowledge. So that he attests to the Truth of a Story in the general, when he knows nothing

at all of the *particulars*. As for the latter part of the *Tale*, viz. *This Fellow's being a Dominican Friar, his Retreat to Ireland, and his Narrative to Mr. Muschamp, the Doctor*, according to his own Confession, took that out of *Foxes* and *Firebrands*; and yet the Certificate runs as if it wete true to *his own certain Knowledge*. I fear this has made such a *Wound* in his *Reputation*, that all the *Balsams* in his Shop will hardly be able to Heal.

I am very Sorry I have been Forced to *Expose* this Gentleman; but since he has published me a *Liar* to all the World, he must pardon me if I Vindicate my self. And seeing he hath put so many *Weapons* into my *Enemy's* Hands, and taken up the *Cudgels* against me without any Provocation, he has no Reason to complain, if he meets with a Rap upon the Fingers when he offers *foul play*. Did this *Learned Doctor* measure my *Throat* by an *High-Church Conscience*; or did he take me to have such a large capacious Swallow, that so *Gross* a *PILL* would slide glibly down without ever chewing it? Did he think, that I would never examine the Truth of such a monstrous Paradox as that he has advanced? But what shall we say? Great is the Force of *Bigotry* and *Party-Zeal*! It makes a Mountain of a *Molehill*, transforms a *Vicar* into an *Arch-bishop*, enables a man to see a Fellow that is invisible to all the World besides, and certify to the Truth of the whole, when he knows nothing of the parts. This Gentleman needed not to ransack his musty Pamphlets to search for *Jesuitism* among *Dissenters*, he may find more of it in his one Equivocating Certificate, than in Five Hundred Conventicles.

WE are presented by Mr. *Agate* [p. 76.] with another Story just as true as the former: Mr. *Trofs's own Pulpit* has been filled with a *Romish Priest*, the first Letter of whose Name is *Ferguson*, who came over with the *Prince of Orange*. Now, says Mr. *Agate*, as good Fortune would have it, he is since proved to be a *Papist* in Disguise, by this means: There was one Mr. *Cromwel* under Sentence of *Condemnation* at *Litchfield*, in the Year 1691, who made this following Confession to *Dean Addison*, viz. That he (i. e. *Cromwel*) had been a *Covenant Servant* with the late *Duke of Monmouth*, and attended him at *Weston Fight*, whence he happened to make his Escape with *Ferguson*; they both together got over into *Spain*, where *Ferguson* went constantly in the *Habit* of a *Dominican Friar*, and in that *Habit* celebrated *Mass*, as Mr. *Cromwel* with his

own

own Ears and Eyes both heard and saw. The Original of this, signed by two Clergy-men who had the same Relation from *Cromwel*, is said to be now in *Mr. Walker's* Hands.

BUT whatever is pretended, the *Pulpit* in which *Mr. Ferguson* preached, was not then *Mr. Tross's*, but the Old *Mr. Hallet's*, who no way gave his Consent to what was done; when he came to go up into his *Pulpit*, he found a Soldier at the Foot of the Steps leading up into it, who told him, He was ordered to keep it for *Mr. Ferguson*; upon which *Mr. Hallet* withdrew, and was followed by his Clerk, and the most considerable Men of his Congregation. That this is true as to Matter of Fact, there be a Hundred still living can attest.

WERE it otherwise, the Story is too *Fictitious* to support the Charge of *Jesuitism* against *Dissenters*. I have my self no Acquaintance with *Mr. Ferguson*, but I desired a Friend of mine to shew him this Passage; upon which he sent me this following Certificate.

WHereas I have been most villanously Calumniated by one *J. Agate*, who stileth himself *M. A.* in a Pamphlet intituled, *Plain Truth*, &c. p. 77. as if after the Defeat of the Duke of Monmouth, I had not only made my Escape into Spain, in the company of one *Cromwel*, who had been a Covenant-Servant with the said Duke; but that I had there both constantly gone in the Habit of a Dominican Friar, and in that Habit celebrated Mass: I do hereby solemnly, and in the presence of GOD, publish and declare, That as I made my Escape, after the Defeat of the aforesaid Duke, from *Topsham* directly to *Holland*, without having been either then, or at any other time, in *Spain*, *Portugal*, or *France*; so I do most sacredly affirm, That I never, either directly or indirectly, made Profession of the Romish Religion, which I always did, and do still, believe, to be both Heretical and Idolatrous: much less was I ever of, or did on any Occasion whatsoever wear the Habit, either of a Dominican, or any other of their Religious Orders. And I do further add, That as I never knew any of the Name of *Cromwel* attending upon, or in any station relating to the Duke of Monmouth, and consequently could not make my Escape in company of such a Person; so I undertake to exact such Satisfaction of the forementioned *J. Agate*, as thereby both to Vindicate my self from the Wicked and Abominable Slanders, which he hath barbarously fastened on me, and to give

give the said Agate cause to Repent his having *Attacked and injured me in the manner he has done.*

Given under my Hand,
July 5th, 1708.

Robert Ferguson.

AND, as good Luck would have it, (to use Mr. Agate's own Expression) there be many, both Church-men and Dissenters, still living in these Parts, who know the most considerable part of this Relation to be true. Mr. Ferguson having Absconded for some time after Monmouth's Rout, came at last to this City, and under the Notion of a Tradesman took up his Quarters, first at the *Plume of Feathers* without Northgate, and afterwards at the *Red-Lyon* in High-street. He contracted an Acquaintance with Mr. Richard Sheers, who recommended to him one Matthew Damrel, as a person that would be Faithful to him. This Damrel is still living, who assures me, He directed him from Exeter to Topsham, saw him safely lodged there; and all this while there was no such man as Cromwel in his company. He was visited in that Retirement by Mr. Ezek. Stephens, now living in Mr. Walker's Parish, who saw no Cromwel with him. Eliz. Dennis is at this present living in Topsham, and was at that time a Servant with Mr. Walter Lyle; by her I am informed, That Mr. Ferguson came to her Master's House in company with one Mr. Harrison, a Monmouthian, whose Widow is still living, and confirms this Circumstance. Eliz. Dennis adds further, That Mr. Ferguson lay concealed at her Master's House for 4 or 5 Weeks: That when an Opportunity presented, she went into the same Boat with him, and in his company rowed down the River as far as Exmouth, where lay a Bark bound for Ostend, of which William Taylor was Master; to whom she presented Mr. Ferguson as a particular Friend of her Master's, who lay under a Cloud, and was willing to retire privately out of the Kingdom. She assures me, That all this while there was no such man as Cromwel ever in his company. The Master of the Bark is still living, and has solemnly protested in my hearing, That he sailed directly from Topsham-Bar for Ostend, and thence up the Canal to Bruges (on the Borders of Holland); and that there was no living Soul in the Bark besides Mr. Ferguson and the Ships Crew: And that upon his return, he understood the Quality of his Passenger. When Mr. Ferguson came over with the Prince of Orange, Eliz. Dennis waited on him at Exeter, who

who presented her with a small Token as an Acknowledgement of her former Services.

If this be not sufficient, Mr *Agate* may consult Mr. *Robert Lyle* and Mr *William Smith*, who are *Men of Reputation*, and no *Dissenters* : So that this whole Story must be an absolute Forgery ; whether it be the Invention of *Cromwel* that is dead, or others that be alive, Mr. *Walker* and his two Vouchers may determine that between themselves.

I have been more particular in my Confutation of these two Stories, that the *Gentleman* who is driving on the Trade of a SCANDAL HUNTER, and has been fishing from *Berwick* to the *Lands-End* for TALES to Blacken the *Dissenters*, may see that his Intelligence is not always to be depended on. And the truth on't is, when we reflect upon those *Memoirs* that we have been presented with from *Litchfield* and *Plymouth*, *Okehampton* and *Exeter-Colledge*, we may easily conjecture what a rare Collection of *Tales* the World is like to be blest withall, when the Cockatrice Eggs are once fully Hatched.

THERE are several other *Stories*, to which Mr. *Agate* has added such Particulars as make for his Purpose, without any Authority from his *Authors* : Thus he tells us of one *Malone*, a *Carmelite Friar*, sent from *France* to distract the *Protestants*, by devising new Doctrines *acting the Puritan* [p. 71.]; for which he cites *Foxes*, &c. Part 2. p. 49. But in that *Author* there is no such thing said as *acting the Puritan*; this is foisted in by my *Antagonist*. The Doctrines they were to preach up, were the Doctrines of *Free-will*, and *Man's Righteousness not depending on the Faith of Christ*, p. 47. which every Body knows are far enough from being *Puritanical Doctrines*.

IN the same Page, he mentions one *Throgmorton*, who being condemn'd for Treason, confess'd, That he knew above 12 *Romish Emissaries* that Preach'd among the *Puritans* by the *Jesuites Order*. This in the *Margin* he calls, *A fruitful Testimony*; by which, I suppose, he means a *Testimony* of his own fruitful Invention. The Preaching of these *Sparks* among the *Puritans*, is a perfect FORGERY of Mr. *Agates*, and his own *Authors* say no such thing*.

AGAIN; This *Gentleman* produces a *Papish Priest*, one *Ramsay* [p. 72.], who in *Cromwel's* time preached among the

* *Foxes*, &c. pt. 2d, p. 61.

the *Holy Brethren*, the *Presbyterians* and *Independents*. Here again we see the prevalency of bad Habits; he toasts in the *Holy Brethren*, and the *Presbyterians*, when his own *Author* makes no mention of them †.

HE tells us further [p. 73.], That one *Brown*, a *Romish Priest*, went into *Scotland*, about the Year 1641, and confessed upon his Death-bed, That he had preached as downright *Poper* in the *Covenanters Conventicles*, as ever he preached in the *Church of Rome*. I have not seen the History of this *Brown*, but it must be a *Fiction*; for at the time mentioned the *Covenanters* in *Scotland* had the Power in their own Hands, and possession of the Publick Churches: And nothing can be more ridiculous, than to talk of *Conventicles* among the *Covenanters* in the Year referred to.

BUT the most unlucky Instance he has yet hit upon, is that of Father *Bernard*, who was himself a *Jesuite*, and gives us a long Catalogue of *Romish Priests* that frequented the Meetings of *Presbyterians* and *Independents*, in the Garb of Ministers, thumping the Pulpit undiscovered for many years, [p. 73.] For the Proof of this, he quotes *Mutatus Polemo*, Printed 1650. This *Bernard* dedicates his Worshipful Pamphlet to the Lord President *Bradshaw*, extolling him to the Skies for his Courage and Resolution, in pronouncing Sentence on King *Charles* the 1st; he charges that Prince with Tyranny, with the Blood of 500000 Christians, with poisoning his Father, betraying his Friends, with Perjury and Perfidy, beyond all Example*. He represents the *Cavaliers* as *Buzzards*, *Fools* †, as *Damme Blades*, ‡ and Men of no Religion †. He owns himself to be a Priest during the Civil Wars, and that there were Priests and Jesuits enough in Oxford (the King's Head-Quarters) to furnish all the Royal Garrisons in England*. When King *Charles*, after the Defeat of all his Armies, surrendered himself to the Scots, and Oxford was reduced by Sir *Thomas Fairfax*, the *Jesuits* consulted amongst themselves, what Course to steer next, and it was resolved amongst them, to follow their Old Master to the *Scotish Camp*; where, to conceal themselves, they assume all Shapes. He that crewhile was a Commander in a Rafting Equipage, is now slinked into a Cobling-Stall, a Tapsters Apron, or a Pulpit-Thumping

F

Pres-

† Foxes and Firebrands, pt. 2d, p. 94. * Mutatus Polemo, f. 2. † Ib. f. 4. ‡ Ib. p. 28. † Ib. f. 5. * Ib. p. 6.

'Presbyters lippo †. When they had skulked awhile in those Disguises amongst the Scots, they at last slip into *France*. The Design of the Pamphlet is to perswade the World, that the *Presbyterians* and *Cavaliers* were influenced by *Jesuitical Councils*, in their Attempts to restore King Charles to the Throne of his *Ancestors*; But it is no where said, as Mr. Agate pretends, that those *Priests* did *Thump* the *Pulpits* in *Presbyterian Meetings*; it is a perfect Forgery, nor can it be true, for the *Presbyterians* at that time had the *Publick Churches*: And to talk of *Presbyterian Meetings* then, is as absurd as to talk of *Episcopal Meetings* after the *Restoration*. The Reader may guess what Credit he deserves, when he talks with so much Confidence of the *Sense* of the *Church Catholick* for 1500 Years together, whilst he, with all his Bluster, understands not the *History* of the last Century. The *Plymouth Doctor*, who it is likely sent him those *Memoirs*, should have supervised his Work to prevent such *Horrid Blunders*.

MY Antagonist goes on [p. 74.]; Dr. Oats (says he) swears that White, Morgan and Ireland, preached in Scotland under the Notion of *Presbyterians*. But by this Gentleman's leave, Dr. Oats only says, That the *Jesuites* employed those Fellows to go and preach under the notion of *Presbyterians*; but he no where says, they actually did Preach, or that the *Presbyterians* gave them Opportunity to put their Instructions in Practice.

TO clinch the Nail, Mr. Agate introduces Mr Baxter, confessing, That the *Popish Brood* crept in among the *Nonconformists*, not only to spy out their Minds and Ways, but to head the Party [p. 78.] For this he quotes *Key for Catholicks*, p. 326. Mr. Baxter says no such thing in the page referred to; he says indeed, *There is scarce any Party but they creep in amongst*. But in this very page he tells us of the *Presbyterians*, That he sees no Reason to think that ever the *Papists* had any Interest in them of any men.

3. A Third Remark which I shall make on those Stories Mr. Agate has produced is, that several of these very Men he mentions as *Priests*, and *Jesuites*, did officiate in the Church of England. Thus Thomas Heath, whom our Author mentions [p. 70.] preached in the Cathedral Church at Rochester*, and was discovered by a Note he drop'd in the Pulpit, as pulling

† Mutatus Polemo, p. 10. * Foxes, &c. p. 31.

pulling out his *Handkerchief*. The same is affirmed of *Jackson*, mentioned *Plain Truth*, p. 72. of whom tis said, *He preached in the publick Churches at Dublin* †. Tis indeed said, *That he preached amongst the Nonconformists too*; but still the Church has as great an Interest in him as the *Dissenters*; though perhaps neither one nor t'other may be true; for Mr. *Catherwood*, the Discoverer of this *Jackson*, was by his own Confession a *Haunter of Bawdy-Houses*.

AMONGST all the Instances produced by this Gentleman, I can't imagine the Reason, why he should bring upon the Stage the two famous Jesuites *Parsons* and *Campion* [p. 72.], (for so I suppose the *Plymouth Doctor* wrote him, though he has Blundered upon *Campanella*) the former of these had his Education in *Baliol-Colledge*, and the latter was *Proctor* of the same University in the Year 1568 ‖. And does not Mr. *Agate* argue most profoundly, when he proves the *Dissenters* to be *Jesuites*, because One of that Order was *Proctor* of the University of Oxford? But this tis to be a *Master of Arts*, and *understand Logick*!

4. A Fourth Remark which I make on these Stories is, that abundance of them relate only to the *Quakers*, *Ranters*, and other *Enthusiastick Persons*, for whom I pretend not to be an Advocate. Tis confessed, that in *Cromwel's Army* an *uncontrolled License of Holding-forth* was encouraged and indulged: A Time that was, when *Trumpeters* and *Drummers* sat up for *Preachers* and *Expounders*; when *Scarlet Cloaks*, and *Silk Swashes*, were preaching down *Gowns* and *Universities*, and every private *Centinel* was ready to beat his *Sword* into a *Plow-share*, his *Spear* into a *Pruning-hook*, and conceit himself as *Duly Qualified* to cultivate and manure his *Master's Vineyard*. But this is what the *Presbyterians* did utterly Dislike, and publickly Protest against.

WHEN the Pulpit was open to every bold *Mechanick*, tis possible a *Priest* or *Jesuite* might slip into it: Mr. *Pryn* and *Edwards* were both *Presbyterians*, and most of the Stories which they relate, are Complaints of this Nature. I am as much against such *Medly* and *Confusion* as Mr. *Agate* himself is: As for *Coleman*, *Hallingham* and *Benson*, mentioned by Mr. *Agate*, [p. 72.] they are said to breed a *Faction* among the *German*

F 2

He-

† Foxes, &c. pt. 2d, p. 109. ‖ Fullers Ch: Hist: L. 9. pag. 114

Hereticks, and induce many to deny their *Baptism* ** ; and what am I concerned with such ?

§. I desire the *Reader*, in the last place, to consider, that supposing all these *Stories*, to be true, which this *Gentleman* has raked together ; yet the *Dissenters*, for whom I plead, are no more liable to the Charge of *Jesuitism*, than the *Established Church* it self, in which several *Papists* in Disguise have possessed some of its *highest Dignities*. I hinted in my last at Dr. Goodman, who was Bishop of Gloucester, and died a *Roman Catholick*. In the Reign of King James I, the *Popish Arch-bishop* of Spalato *, came over into England, pretending himself a New Convert, was made *Dean* of Windsor, and had other *Preferments* conferred upon him. After a while, the *Pope* and he were reconciled, and back trudged he to Rome.

I have already hinted at the Famous Jesuite *Campion*, who was *Proctor* of the *University* of Oxford. And Dr. *Humphrey*, who was *Professor* of *Divinity* in that *Academy*, acknowledges †, That several *Jesuites* had been *Oxonians*. Dr. *Theodore Price* was *Vice-Dean* of *Westminster*, recommended by *Arch-Bishop Laud* ‡, as the fittest Man, in his Conscience, to make a *Welsh Bishop* : He lived an *Epicure*, and died a professed *Papist*. 'Twas one Article of Impeachment against the forementioned *Arch-Bishop* †, " That he provided Maintenance and Entertainment for one *Monsieur St. Giles*, a *Popish Priest*, in the *University* of Oxford, knowing him to be " a *Popish Priest*. Mr. *Gage*, who was first a *popish Priest*, and afterwards embraced the *Protestant Religion*, tells us *, " That when he was at Rome, the *Rector* of the *English-Colledge* of *Jesuits* assured him, That *Arch-Bishop Laud* had " so great a Complaisance for the *Holy See*, that when he had " hammered out a *Common-prayer Book* for the *Scots*, he sent " it to Rome, to be first viewed and approved by the *Pope* and " his *Cardinals* ; and that the said *Rector* was sent for by some " of the *Cardinals*, and his Opinion asked concerning it. Mr. *Agate's* own Author, *Father Bernard*, tells us †, " That " *Priests* and *Jesuites* were dispersed in all the *Kings Garrisons* : " That

** *Foxes, &c.* p. 38. * *Fullers Ch: Hist: L. 17. p. 94, &c.* † *Præfat. ad Jesuitismi partem primam.* ‡ *Pryns Canturburys Decree*, p. 355. † *Ib.* p. 39. * *Gages Survey of the West-Indies*, p. 208. † *Mutatus Polemo*, p. 6

“ That there were few without *some*, some with *many*, and none without *any*. That Sir *John Kempsfield* ¶, an Eminent Commander of Horse, never Charged without a Crucifix on his Breast: And that Father *Car* †, a *Dominican*, was a Quarter-master in the King’s Army. Nay, a more unexceptionable Historian than this *paltry Friar*, my Lord *Clarendon* confesses, ††, “ That the Roman Catholicks were very numerous in *Oxford*, the Kings Head-Quarters. And no great wonder if these *Locusts* did multiply there, when two successive Governours of that City, Sir *Arthur Aston* and Col. *Gage*, were both of that Communion ¶¶. Nay, the former of these gives this Character of the latter ††, “ That he was the most *Jesuited Papist* in the World, and that he kept a *Jesuite* in his House. And *Gage* owned to K. *Charles* himself, That he heard Mass every Day in *Oxford*. That Noble Historian tells us further **, “ That Sir *John Smith*, Commilitary-General of Horse in the Royal Army, was a *Roman Catholick*; and Col. *Web* was of the same Communion *. Tis possible, some of this sort of Cattle might be found in both Armies, but with this remarkable Difference: When *Cromwel* caught a Priest, he *strung him up*, according to Mr. *Agates* own Account [*Pl. Truth*, p. 72.]; whilst K. *Charles* advanced them to Eminent Commands, intrusting his University and chief Garrisons to the care of their prime Confidants.

IF we come down to the Reign of K. *Charles* 2d, I find that *Henry Starkey* was Arraigned at the Sessions in the *Old-Baily*, and found Guilty of High-Treason. He pleaded, That he was a Major in the late Kings Army †: And it was proved how he boasted, That he had said Mass twenty and twenty times in that Army. About the same time one Parson *Philips* renounced the Protestant Religion; but Father *Evers* ¶, advised him, “ To continue his Station for a Season where he was; for by pretending himself a Minister of the Church of England, he would be better qualified, and more capacitated, to promote the *Romish* Interest, than if he should immediately pull off his Mask, and own himself a Papal Convert.

BUT

¶ Mutatus Polemo, p. 3 † *Ib*: p. 5 †† *Clarendons Hist*: Vol. 2d, pt. 2d, p. 528 ¶¶ *Ib*: p. 527 †† *Ib*: p. 553 ** *Ib*: p. 475 * *Ib*: p. 529 † *Hist. Damnable Popish Plots*, pag. 384 ¶ *Hist. of Popish Sham Plots*, p. 103

BUT to go no further back than the Unhappy Reign of King James, Mr. Agate has not given one Instance of any *Dissenting Minister*, who at that time faced about to the Church of Rome; but there were many who pretended to be *zealous* Church-men formerly, who then threw off the Mask, and declared themselves *true* Catholics. The Bishops of Oxford and Chester †, are left upon Record as the *unhappy Tools* of Popery. Dr. Obadiah Walker was a Remarkable Convert in those Days, whose Name almost every person has heard of. And the famous Mr. Robert Charnock, who made his *Exit* at Tyburn, on the Account of the Assassination Plot, was *Fellow* of Magdalen-Colledge ††, and a Papist. There is a Practitioner of Physick, now living in Dorset, (as I am told by a Gentleman who knows him) who was formerly Parson of Soply, near Christ-Church in Hampshire, and in the Days of King James professed himself a *Roman* Catholic, remaining so to this very Day. Did I make it my Business to Hunt for Stories of this Nature, I make no Question but many other Instances might be easily produced; but this is enough to let the Reader see, that those Stones which Mr. Agate hath so *maliciously* thrown at me, will recoil, and break his own Head. Far be it from me to Imitate the Disingenuity of my *Antagonist*, for the sake of these *Fellows*, to impute *Jesuitism* to the Church of England; all that I aim at is, to let the Reader see, that though it were true that Priests and *Romish* Emissaries have, under various Disguises, crept into the *Dissenting-meetings*, (of which our *Author* has not given us One Instance since our *Religious Assemblies* were allowed of by *publick Authority*) yet tis as true, they have crept into the Established Church itself: And that the one is as Obnoxious to this Invidious Charge as the other, and both must *stand or fall* together.

THAT I might convince our *Author* of his approaching nearer to the Church of Rome than the *Dissenters*, I minded him of his LUCKY HIT which he discovered in the Pulpit, viz. That Christ had a Natural Body, and a Spiritual Body; his Natural Body is in Heaven, and his Spiritual in the Sacrament. To Vindicate this Expression, Mr. Agate tells us, [p. 79.] That Christs Body is really present in the Sacrament of

† *Hist. of England*, Vol. 3. p. 462 †† *Hist. of K. Will.* Vol. 1st, pag. 237

of the Lords-supper, some how or other ; That this has ever been the Doctrine of the Christian Church, and is plainly founded in the Holy Scriptures. Could this Gentleman make good his Assertion, and produce these Scriptures, he would do mighty Service to the Church of Rome. If Christs Body be really present, his Real Body must be present ; and if his Real Body be present, his Flesh and Bones must be there ; for these are the REAL and ESSENTIAL Parts thereof, as he HE himself assures us, Luke 24. 39, 42. 'Tis true, the Council of Trent III, thunders out an *Anathema* against all such as do deny the Body and Blood of Christ to be really and truly in the Sacrament. Were Christs Humane Nature really present, and united to the Divine, I see no Reason why it should not be the Object of our Religious Adoration, which is the grossest part of Popery. I confess, some Ancient and Modern Authors have expressed themselves oddly enough on this Head ; for my part, I am no such Idolizer of mystical Nonsense, as to Adore it for the sake of its Gray Hairs ; the real presence of Christs Body in the Sacrament, was never yet an Article of my Faith, and I believe it will be a great while before it will. I rather chuse, with Tertullian ††, a Primitive Father, to paraphrase our Saviour's Words, *This is my Body*, that is, the Figure or Representation of my Body. If some have said, That Christs Body is present in the Sacrament in a spiritual manner, their meaning only is, That it is present to our Faith, and that devout Communicants do as really believe that Christ Died and Suffered for them, as if they saw him crucified before their Eyes. This is quite another Thing than His having two different Bodies, one natural in Heaven, and another spiritual in the Sacrament : This is a peculiar Whimsey of our Authors, and tis pity but he should have the Honour of the Invention.

I proceed to consider Mr. Agates second Grand Charge against the Dissenters, and that is their pretended Donatism ; in the Proof of which he is as defective as in his former. That the Reader may the better judge at whose Door this ugly Brat ought to be laid, whether at his, or mine ; I think it necessary to acquaint him wherein we agree, and in what we differ ; and what are those Reasons which support my own Opinion, and confront his.

TIS

III Concil. Trident. § 13. Can. 1 †† Hoc est Corpus meum, id est, Figura Corporis mei. Tertul. adv. Marcion. L. 4.

'Tis agreed then by us both, That the *Donatists* were Real *Schismatics*, and justly censured as such by all other Churches: That *Cecilian* was Lawful Bishop of *Carthage*: That by the Contrivance of one *Lucilla*, a Factious Potent Lady, and some other Malecontents, a Synod of Bishops were prevailed upon to come to *Carthage*, to condemn *Cecilian* for those Crimes of which he was not guilty; to Depose him as much as in them lay, and Ordain one *Majorinus* in his room: That they appropriated the Name of the Catholick Church to their own Party, condemning those for no Christians who owned *Cecilians* Title to the Bishoprick of *Carthage*: So far we both concur.

BUT the Difference betwixt us is, Wherein the *Schism* of these *Donatists* consists, and what it was that denominated them *Schismatics*. I affirm, That it was their confining the Catholick Church to their own Faction, and their Uncharitable Censuring and Condemning all those who did not subscribe to their Fancies. On the other hand, Mr. *Agate* asserts, That they were not condemned for *Schismatics*, because they confined the Catholick Church to a small part of it; but for setting up separate Meetings, as our Dissenters do.

BEFORE I proceed to the Confirmation of my own Opinion, I shall lay down this as a *Maxim*, to which the Common Reason of Mankind must needs subscribe, That the Denomination of any Thing ought to be taken from its greater part; and therefore, if it appears that the greater part of the *Donatists* did not set up separate Meetings, their *Schism* certainly could not consist in that of which they were not guilty. These Things premised, I shall observe this method.

I. I shall prove, That the setting up an *opposite Bishop*, and a *separate Meeting*, at *Carthage*, was the Act of some particular Bishops; and that neither the Clergy and Laity of their Respective Diocesses, nor the Neighbouring Bishops, were responsible for their Irregular Proceedings.

II. That though at *Carthage* there was an *opposite Church* set up, yet in other Towns and Cities the *Donatists* continued in Subjection to their *Lawful Bishops*, had their Assemblies in the publick Churches, and the greater part of the People adhering to them; and therefore their *Schism* must consist in something else than what is alledged by Mr. *Agate*.

1. THE setting up an *Opposite Bishop* at *Carthage* was the Act of a few particular Bishops, for which their *Diocesses* and *Neighbours* are not responsible. This I prove;

(1.) FROM an *Authority* of which Mr. *Agate* has a very high Opinion, which is that of his own dear self, who in his *Reply*, p. 54. affirms, *That if a Bishop should be a Socinian, an Apostate, or an Atheist, this would not Unchristian his whole Diocess*: And a *Schismatick* can be no worse than one of these. And indeed, no Reason can be assigned, why they who are ignorant of the Crime, should be involved in the Guilt. If the *Judges* and *Juries* in *Westminster-Hall* should be so far corrupted as to condemn an innocent Person, I see no Reason why we, who live at a distance, and know nothing of the Intrigue, may not rather conclude the Person to be really Guilty, than that a whole Court of *Judicature* should be perjured.

THIS confessed, That *Cecilian* was unjustly Deposed; but this was not the Fault of those who lived some Scores and Hundreds of Miles distant, and who knew nothing of the matter but as it was Reported to them: The *Bishops* guilty of this Violence, were actually at *Carthage*, the Scene on which the Crimes objected to *Cecilian* were pretended to be acted; they had an Opportunity of making the strictest Enquiry, and the Witnesses were on the spot: Had they been sincere, they were in a much better Capacity to inform themselves aright, than those Prelates who met at *Arles* and *Rome*, 500 or 1000 Miles distant, and on t'other side the *Midland Sea*, by whom *Cecilian* was acquitted. Though the Leading Men in this *Carthage* Synod were Bribed by *Lucilla*, yet this was a Secret not made known to the World till many Years afterwards*: So that had the *Donatists* contented themselves with a bare esteeming *Majrinus* to be the Lawful Bishop of *Carthage*, this had only been a Mistake, or a Misapprehension, as to the Matter of Fact, and no *Schism*: The setting up an *Opposite Altar* at *Carthage*, was indeed the Fault of such as were concerned, but not of those that lived in remote Provinces.

G

(2.) THE

* *Vid. Monumenta vetera ad Donatist. Hist. pertinent. apud Dupin, p. 167. &c.*

(2.) **THAT** other Persons ought not to be Responsible for the unjust Proceedings of this Synod, I prove, by the Sense and Practice of the Catholick Church in like cases. *Cecilian* is not the only Bishop in the World who has been Deposed for *Sham Crimes*, and by a numerous Council, whilst those who have acquiesced in the unjust Sentence, have not been reputed *Schismatics*: This was the Case both of *Nazianzen* and *Chrysostom*, two of the most Eminent Divines the *Greek Church* ever produced; and the Brightest Lights that ever shone in that *Horizon*. The first of these came to *Constantinople*, when the City was almost wholly *Arian*: By his Affectionate Sermons, and Cogent Arguments, he converted the greater part of the Inhabitants to the *Orthodox Faith*; upon which, he was confirmed in that *See* by the Emperor *Theodosius*, and the second General Council held in that City. 'Twas but a little while, before the same Synod caballed against him, and without so much as the pretext or shadow of a Crime, constrained him to resign his Bishoprick, ordaining another in his room. If it be pretended by Mr. *Agate*, That his Resignation was *Voluntary*, and therefore there was no *Injustice* done him; the contrary is evident, from that Tragical Description which he gives us of the *Rage and Fury* that the younger Prelates were transported with: And the *Historian* tells us *, That he delivered up the Authority committed to him, to the Bishops which demanded it at his Hands. And he himself intimates, As if his *Life* were in danger; and therefore begs the Council, That they would grant him a safe, though an inglorious *Life*, when deprived of his *Archiepiscopal Dignity* †. As a Minister of State may be said to be turned out of his Post, when forced to resign the Ensigns of his Office; so this great *Patriarch* may be truly said to be Deposed, when forced to relinquish his Dignity.

IN this Instance, we see a good Bishop causelessly turned out, and another put in his room, and this by One of the Four General Councils, compared by some to the *Four Evangelists*. I desire to ask my *Antagonist*, Whether all those who acquiesced

* Ἀπαύτισι δὲ τοῖς Ἐπισκόποις ἡ παρακαταθήκη ἀπιδόκεν.

Sozom: *Hist.* L. 7. c. 7.

† Ἡμῖν δὲ σωζέσθαι ἄσπονον βίον,
καὶ ἀλλεῖ μὲν ἐν ὁμῶς ἀκίνδονον.

Nazian: *Carmen de vita sua*,

esced in this *unjust Sentence*, and held Communion with the New Bishop, were *Schismatics*? If so, the Universal Church at that time was liable to that Charge.

WE have another Instance, of like Nature, in the Famous *Chrysostom*, who was made Patriarch of *Constantinople* in the beginning of the Fifth Century. By the Severity and Strictness of his *Life* and *Discipline*, he disoblighd the Clergy of that City *: By his *Freedom* in Inveighing against the Luxury of Great Men, and the Modish Vices of the Age, he disgusted the Haughty Courtiers. And the Empress *Eudoxia* became his implacable and bitter Enemy: By her Influence, a Synod of Bishops was convened at *Chalcedon*, who, to make their Court, were ready for any mischief. By them this Excellent Person was Deposed; and though his Intended Banishment was for a while suspended, to appease the Tumults of the people, who had a mighty Veneration for their *Patriarch*, being charmed with his flowing Eloquence; yet, upon a fresh Provocation, *Eudoxia* got another Assembly of Bishops, who confirmed the former Sentence against him, and ordained one *Arsacius* in his room †. So that the case of *Cecilian* at *Carthage*, and *Chrysostom* at *Constantinople*, seems very parallel; they were both *Lawful Bishops*, and *Beloved* of their People; they were both *condemned* by *prejudiced* and *self-interested Synods*; and both fell a *Sacrifice* to *Feminine Revenge* and *Malice*. I would ask my *Antagonist*, Whether all the *Eastern Christians* who acquiesced in this *unjust Sentence*, and held Communion with *Arsacius*, were *Schismatics*, and in a State of *Damnation*? I know no Christian Writer that has affirmed thus of 'em. And therefore, when the *Donatists* are branded with this infamous Crime, 'tis for some other Reason than their bare *misapprehending Majorinus* to be *Lawful Bishop* of *Carthage*, even for their *confining the Catholick Church to their own party*, and their *condemning all such as did not subscribe to their Opinions*.

BUT we need not cross the Seas for Instances of this Nature; we have had in our own *Island*, two Bishops laying Claim to one and the same *Diocess*, without the Imputation of *Schism* to the Friends of either party. 'Tis very well known, that several *English Prelates* were, at the late *Revolution*, deprived of their *Ecclesiastical Dignities*, for refusing the *Oath*

* *Socrat. Hist. Eccles. L. 6. c. 4.* † *Ib. c. 15, 18.*

of Allegiance to King William; amongst whom, Dr. Ken, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, was one; upon which, that Preferment was offered to Dr. Beveridge*, but he refused to accept it, *because the Incumbent was alive*. And I have been informed, That there is an Eminent Bishop now living, who has a *Formal Instrument of Resignation* under his Abdicated Predecessor's own Hand; which seems to intimate, as if his Lordship apprehended him to have some Title, there being no occasion why he should relinquish what he never had. However, what Dr. Beveridge refused, Dr. Kidder accepted of. Upon this, the great Question in Somerset was the same which formerly divided Carthage, *Who was the Lawful Bishop of the Diocese of two Persons pretending to it?* Mr. Agate swore Canonical Obedience to Bp. Kidder. Others thought, that his Predecessor, still living, had the better Title, and done nothing to forfeit his Dignity; But were the Persons that thought so all *Schismatics*, cut off from the Church, and in a State of Damnation? I believe Mr. Agate (as censorious as he is) will not venture to affirm it. Had the *Donatists* contented themselves with a bare Recognizing *Majorinus* to be Bishop of Carthage, this had only been a Speculative Error or Mistake in Matter of Fact; whereas their condemning and unchurching all, such as did not comply with their Humour, made them guilty of a most criminal Schism.

THIS may serve as an Answer to Mr. Agate's Question, which doubtless he looks upon as a very killing one, *Whether if the Donatists had not confined the Catholic Church, or censured their Fellow-christians, they had ceased to be Schismatics* [p. 85.]? As to those who were immediately concerned in the Sham Council which met at Carthage, I have nothing to say; but as this was not the Act of the Hundredth, if the Thousandth, part of the *Donatists*; so I see no Reason why the rest of that Sect, who lived in remote Towns and Cities, would have been *Schismatics*, had it not been for their *uncharitable principles*, any more than those infinite Number of Churches, who acquiesced in the Invidious Deposition of *Chrysostom* and *Nazianzen*, and joyned Communion with those who were unjustly placed in their Seats; or any more than those who looked upon Bishop Ken as Lawful Bishop of Bath and Wells, when Bishop Kidder possessed that Honour.

2. I

* *Hist. K. Will. Vol. 2d, p. 255.*

2. I proceed to show, That the *Donatists* (by which I mean the *major part* of them) were so far from setting up *separate Meetings*, and *opposite Altars*, as Mr. *Agate* every where pretends, that they continued in Communion with their *Lawful Bishops*, performed their *Devotions* in the publick Churches, and had the Bulk of the people concurring with them. That they did not make a Separation from their Bishops, is evident from this: That the Bishops themselves were *first in the Transgression*; they were the *Beginners* of the *Squabble*, and led their Flocks into those *perverse* and *crooked ways* that we are speaking of. St. *Austin* * assures us, That no less than 70 Bishops were concerned in the *Condemnation* of *Cecilian*. The *Primate* of *Numidia* was at their Head, and most of the *Prelates* of that large Province, in which were 155 Bishopricks, acquiesced in what their Brethren had unjustly done. Mr. *Agate* indeed, with his wonted Confidence, affirms [pag. 87.] That if we may believe *Optatus*, the Matter was quite otherwise, and that the *Foundation* of this Schism was not laid by a Council of Bishops, but by *Lucilla* and her *Accomplices*. Yet he [p. 83.] (I thank him) furnishes me with a Citation from that very *Author* which confirms my Assertion: The Church was One (says the *Historian* †) 'till it was divided by the *Ordainers* of *Majorinus*. So that 'twas not *Lucilla*, but the Bishops *Ordaining Majorinus*, who began that fatal *Division*. She might indeed excite and prompt them to it, but there was no *actual* Schism 'till the *opposite Bishop* and *Altar* was erected, according to Mr. *Agate's* own Notion. This *Gentleman* indeed suggests [p. 88.], as if there was a time when they had but *one* Bishop of their side, though afterwards they increased to *forty*, and more. But this is a *false* and *groundless* Imagination, there being (as I have proved) no less than 70 *Prelates* at the very beginning of the Scuffle, and were joyned in a little time by multitudes of others.

BUT to put this Matter beyond all Dispute, I shall present the Reader with an Instance exactly to my purpose, and that

* *Recitatum est quod Septuaginta ferme Episcopi Cecilianum ----- damnauerunt. Augus. Donat. Episc. Ep. 16a. Id. de unitate Eccles. c. 16. † Una erat Ecclesia antequam divideretur ab Ordinatoribus Majorini. Opt. de Schif. Donat. L. 1.*

is the Church of *Cirta*, or *Constantina*; this City is represented as a *most flourishing Noble City*, and formerly the Seat of *K. Juba* ||. The Bishop of this City was one *Sylvanus*, a mighty Stickler for the *Faction*. 'Twas whispered abroad, as if he had formerly been a *Traditor*; upon which Directions were sent to *Zenophilus*, the Governour of *Numidia*, to make a strict Enquiry into this matter. Amongst others, he summons before him one *Victor*, an Inhabitant of *Cirta*. Upon his Examination, he tells the President, *That he knew not the Original of the Quarrel: As for our City*, (says he) *it never had above one Church* †. Upon which *Baluzius* observes, *There was no Division at this time in the Church of Cirta, which had but one Bishop, and he a Donatist* *.

When Mr. *Agate* has consulted this piece of *History*, I desire him to inform us, What made these People *Schismaticks*? They remained united to their *Old Bishop*, set up no *separate Meetings*; nay, were such *Enemies* to Separation, that when the Emperor built a Church for the *Catholicks* to worship GOD in, they violently took it away from them †. I hope it will not be pretended, that they sat up a *separate Meeting* at *Carthage*, when the two Cities were between Two and Three Hundred Miles distant from one another.

AS the *Donatists* had their Bishops to lead them on, so were they followed in their *crooked ways* by the greater part of the People. St. *Austin* confesses, *That in Numidia they were the stronger party* ||; and that *Hippo*, his own City, was in former times almost wholly devoted to the *Faction* †. When there was so great an Harmony between the Priests and the People, no wonder if they were possessed of the publick Churches: That they were so, is evident from these *Decrees of Constantine*, by which they were expelled the publick Temples, and these Structures given to the *Catholicks*. Thus St. *Austin* tells the *Donatists* ††: *Constantine* (says he) *commanded the Churches to be taken from you, and 'twas Julian the Apostate that*

|| *Vid. Hist. Carthag. Collat. apud Dupin, p. 344.* † *Semper Civitas nostra unam Ecclesiam habet. Gest. apud Zenoph. Dupin. p. 167* * *Ib. 172.* † *Ib. p. 189* || *In Numidia vos præpolletis, Austin de Unitate Eccles. c. 16.* † *Civitas mea quæ cum tota esset in Parte Donati, Ep. ad Vincent. 48.* †† *Constantinus vobis Basilicas jussit auferri, Julianus restitui. Aug. cont. Petil. L. 2. c. 92*

that restored them to you. So that if the publick Temples were taken from them, we may most certainly conclude, that they had first the possession of them. I have already shewn, That at *Constantina*, for many Years after the Dissention about *Cecilian*, there was only One Bishop, and he a *Donatist*; and as he had possession of the publick Temple, so his *Faction* was so strong and furious, that they violently took away from the *Catholicks* a Church, which *Constantine* had erected at his own charge for their use, refusing peremptorily to restore it, though urged and commanded by the *Imperial Officers* so to do. However, the Emperor did not think fit to proceed to *Extremeties* against this *mutinous* and *stubborn Generation*; but having commended the *Catholicks* for their *Patience* and *Temper*, he ordered another Place of Worship to be erected for them, and the Expence defrayed out of his own *Exchequer*. So that in this City the *Donatists* had the settled Bishop, and publick Temples at their Devotion, whilst the *Orthodox Party* did set up an opposite Altar and separate Meetings. That this is a true Relation, we are assured by the *Imperial Edict* still upon Record, which the *Latin Reader* may consult at his Leisure *.

Mr. *Agate*, 'tis like, will be ready to cry out again, *Alas for the poor Catholicks!* [p. 88.] But 'tis not an Impertinent and Noisy Exclamation that will overthrow an Argument founded upon plain Matter of Fact. I have Reason to complain of this Gentleman, as guilty of a most Egregious *Falseness* and *Abuse*, when he tells the World [p. 87.], That I am resolved to make it out, that the *Catholicks* were the *Schismatics*, and not the *Donatists*; when there is not one Expression in my whole Book on which to found so FALSE an *Accusation*. I do indeed affirm, That the *Donatists* could not be *Schismatics* for setting up *separate Meetings*, when they had the possession of the publick Temples, with the Countenance of their Old Bishop; and the Reader must judge, whether I have failed in my Proof.

The Truth on't is, the great Principle these furious *Sectaries* were acted by, and the Spring which put all the Wheels in motion, was this, That *Cecilian*, or his Ordainer, was a *Traditor*, and an *Apostate* from the Faith: That all those who owned

* *V: Rescriptum Constantini ad Episcopos Numidas, apud Dupin, p. 189.*

owned him for Lawful Bishop, involved themselves in the same Apostacy, and ceased to be Christians. We are informed by St. Optatus *, That when they *seduced* any from the Catholick Faith, this was the *method* they always took: *Hearken to us, (say they) Redeem your Souls, and become Christians.* Mr. Agate indeed says [p. 84.], *This Principle of theirs was taken up many Years after, when Majorinus, in all probability was dead:* But whether a bare Probability be fit to be opposed to an Authentick Evidence, I must leave that to the Reader's Judgment.

I shall conclude this Head with the Testimonies of two English Bishops, and two of the brightest Ornaments that the Church of England ever had, who say as I do, That the Schism of the Donatists did consist in *their confining the Catholick Church to their own party, and condemning their Fellow-christians.*

THE first is Bishop Stillingfleet, who thus expresses himself †: "Whatever confines, must also divide the Church, for by that Confinement, a Separation is made between the Party confined and the other; which Separation must be made by the Party so limiting Christian Communion, as it was in the case of the Donatists, who are therefore justly charged with Schism, because they confined the Catholick Church within their own Bounds.

TO the same purpose speaks the late Arch-Bishop Tillotson, "The Roman Communion (says he) is plainly founded in Schism, that is the most unchristian and uncharitable Principle that can be, namely that they are the only true Church of Christ, out of which none can be saved; which was the very Schism of the Donatists ‖. I hope Mr Agate will allow these great Men to understand the History of the Church better than he, or I can pretend to; and that, upon second Thoughts, he will Retract his confident Assertion, That to say this was their Schism, is such a Fancy as deserves only to be Laught at [p. 85.].

I come

* *Quæ sunt verba seductionis vestrae omnibus notum est: Vestrum est dicere redimite Animas vestras, estote christiani, Optat: de Schif. Donat: L. 3. § II. † Stillingf: Rational Account, p. 359. ‖ Tillotson's Works in Folio, 4th Edit. pag. 364*

I come now to consider Mr *Agate's Parallel*; what relates to the *Donatists*, may be found in Mr *Long's History* of that Sect; and there is scarce a Citation out of *Austin*, or *Optatus*, but what he found collected to his Hands in that Book. But to make some short Reflections upon this part of his Performance.

First, IF this Method be allowed to be a good way of Arguing, there is no Church whatsoever but may be condemned for the greatest Impleties. 'Tis confessed, there are some, both *Church-men* and *Dissenters*, who have done very Ill Things; but if the Crimes of a *few* may be imputed to the *whole*, there is not a Society upon Earth but may be proved to be *Jews* or *Pagans*, *Turks* or *incarnate Devils*. The *Alcoran* allows a Man to keep as many Concubines as he can maintain; there be some Church-men have taken the same License, are they therefore all *Mahometans*? We had a Gang of Men prosecuted lately in our *Metropolis*, for Horrid and Unnatural Crimes; but were the *Londoners* therefore all *Sodomites*? Were the *Apostles* all Traytors, because one was a *Judas*, and had a Devil? Is the Lustre of the *Angelick Order* stained, because some of their Number have transformed themselves into black and ugly Fiends? Is the Church of *England* chargable with the Felonies and Robberies, for which some of its Members are every Year strung up? Suppose some *Dissenters* have done and said the Ill Things Mr *Agate* mentions, must the whole Body of them be Responsible for their Crimes? Where is the Conscience of such a *Procedure*?

MY *Antagonist* not only imputes the Miscarriages of a *few* to the *whole* Party, but he objects to me the Whimies of those people which I had in most express Words disclaimed. I told him in my *Defence*, I would not be an Advocate for *Quakers*, *Ranters*, and such wild Enthusiasts, who exclaimed against the Church of *England* as the *Whore of Babylon*, and her Clergy as *Devils* and *Sons of Belial*. Yet he picks Stories out of *Edwards's Gangrana*, which refer to those *Sectarian Humourists*, as if they were the General Practices of the *Presbyterians*. 'Tis true, those people go under the general Denomination of *Dissenters*, and so they do of *Protestants*; yet Mr. *Agate* would think it very unfair that a *Papist* should object their Extravagancies to him, and to his Church.

BESIDES all this, he advances many things in his *Parallel*, which are absolutely false: Of this Nature is the Abuse which he has put upon Mr. *Tross* [p. 92.] *The Ministers of*
H the

the Established Church he (Mr. Tross) says are grossly Ignorant, dangerously Erroneous, notoriously Profane, &c. Did Mr. Tross indeed say so, he could intend no less, Than that all, or the generality of our *English* Clergy did deserve this Character; but this is a most unjust perversion of Mr. Tross's words, which are these: 'When the Minister of the former (*i.e.* any particular Church) is either grossly Ignorant, or dangerously Erroneous, &c. in such a case tis Lawful to leave such an One, and attend upon One that is better Qualified, of what Ordination or Profession soever EITHER of them are. So that Mr Tross plainly supposes, that both good and bad Ministers may be amongst Church-men and Dissenters; and tis Lawful for a man to choose the best.

WITH the same Sincerity and Truth he cites Mr *Baxter*, when he tells the World [p. 135], *That according to Father Baxter, Bishops are the Devil's Instruments*; for which he cites his *Concord*, p. 122, but it should be 123. Mr *Baxter* having spoken of the perpetual Imprisonment, Banishment, or Death of *Faithful Ministers*, adds these very Words, "And the Prelates that cause this, will be taken by the suffering people for Thorns and Thistles, and grievous Wolves that devour the Flock, and Military Ministers of the Devil. Where is the Reason, where is the Conscience, of making Mr. *Baxter* pass this Censure upon Bishops in general, when he only supposes that poor suffering people may give this character of cruel, persecuting Prelates.

'TIS no less false, [p. 94] *That the Church Plate belonging to St. David's was put to the common Use of a Publick-House, by the Old G--- at the Oxford-Inn*; by whom he means Mr. *Goswell*, who formerly kept that Inn. Mrs. *Hoar*, who at this present time keeps the same Inn, who frequents her Church, and lives in more than Ordinary Reputation, has assured me, That she Lived with the same Mr *Goswell* Seven Years in the time this is pretended to be done: That she never knew any Church Plate put to a common Use in his House; and in her Conscience believes, there never was any so employ'd. She further adds, That he had a large Silver Flagon gilt, belonging to St. Peter's, which he kept many Years in a Case lined with Bays, and at last very generously restored it to the aforesaid Church, to be made use of at the Communion. This she affirms upon her own certain Knowledge.

'TIS

'TIS another absolute Untruth, *That we do Hug the accursed Author* (as he calls him [p. 95]) *of the Cristian Rights*. That Gentleman is a *Graduate* in the University of *Oxford*, and has (as I am credibly informed) at this very day a *Fellowship* in one of the most considerable *Colledges* there; And why should the *Dissenters* be accountable for any of his *Hard Sayings*? If the *Observer* and *Review* have ridiculed the *Scriptures*, as he pretends, they must Answer for it themselves, I am neither the *Corrector* nor *Licenser* of the Press.

THERE be some of his Accusations so very *fulsome*, that there is no need of a Confutation: Of this Nature is *the tempting Wives from their Husbands, and preaching the Lawfulness of Adultery* [p. 95]. These are Calumnies so gross and nauseous, that the most vulgar Stomach cannot digest them. And he is *challenged* and *defied* to prove this charge; or Name those Scandalous Offenders who have been cast out of the *Established Church*, and received by the *Dissenters* with open Arms.

THAT the *Dissenters do Relieve and Employ none but those of their own party*, is another most Egregious *Falshood*, and known to be so by so many Thousands in this City, that it argues in that Man a *Forehead* impregnable against all the Assaults of *Modesty* and *Virtue*, who durst proclaim so bold a Calumny both from the Press and Pulpit.

WHEN my *Antagonist* was running his *Parallel* between the *DONATISTS* and *DISSENTERS*, he fancied himself doubtless amongst *Euclid's Elements*, and dream'd of nothing less than Demonstration. But to let the *Reader* see, That the Cap which he has made for others fits his own Noddle, That he has been drawing his own Picture, And that an *African Donatist* and an *English High-Flyer* do very much resemble one another, I shall briefly recapitulate the Account which he has given us of those *Schismaticks*; by which it will appear, that 'tis much more applicable to Him and his *FURIOUS TRIBE*, than to *Me*, or any of my *Friends*.

Mr. *Agate* gives us this following Account of the *Donatists*, p. 92, &c.

[1.] *THE Donatists were condemned for Schismatics by all the Christian World.*

Ireland; and by consequence all other Churches must condemn his *separating Principles*.

[2.] *TO make Profelytes, the Donatists would be always railing at the Catholics and commending themselves, &c.*

deracy with all the Deists and

[3.] *THE Donatists were continually tampering with the Female Sex.*

Masters of Arts been always able to conjure down the unclean Spirit; but I leave the raking in Dunghills to my Opponent, as having the greater Gust to that Employment.

[4.] *AS to Matters of Worship, the Donatists rejected the Catholics Liturgy.*

that pass, I would desire him to inform us in his next, Whether he never heard of any *Clergy-man*, who omitted the Prayers particularly appointed to be read some 16 months ago, upon the Account of the Union of the Two Kingdoms.

[5.] *THE Donatists treated the Sacrament with Contempt--- broke the Communion Plate, and sold it, &c.*

[1.] Mr. *Agate* is a *Separatist* from all the Churches in the World, except the *Episcopal Party* in *England* and

all other Churches must condemn his *separating Principles*.

[2.] Mr. *Agate* tells the World, That the *Dissenters* are Villains, Rebels, Schismatics, and the Spawn of *Jesuites*: That they are in Confederacy with all the *Deists* and *Libertines* in the Nation: That they are sacrilegious, cruel, and no Christians*.

[3.] I can give Instances (more than a good many) in which *Lechery* has lurked under a Crape Gown; nor have

[4.] Mr. *Agate* has not yet proved, that the *Catholics* had a *stinted Liturgy* for any Province in *Africa*; but to let

[5.] 'TIS a Question whether this *Institution* was Honoured, and the Reverence due to it Secured, when an Order of

* *V: Reply*, p. 10, 11, 56, 59. *Pl: Truth*, p. 53, 95, 96, &c.

of *Chamber* was made in this City, *April* 16th 1683, That none should have License to sell Ale, but such as did receive the *Sacrament*. And we have been told by *Dr Fuller*, that *Church Plate* and *Vestments* have been sold to the best Bidder even by the *Church of England* it self *.

[6.] *TO Ruine the Catholics, the Donatists never scrupled to joyn with the professed Enemies of Christianity, particularly with Julian the Apostate.*

Protestants; and Bands of those inhumane Cut-Throats were to be waisted over into *Britain*, in order to joyn the *Royal Army*, and crush the *Parliamentarians* †.

[7.] *THE Donatists were of an implacable and bitter Temper.*

less is a mighty Argument of a meek and quiet Spirit ‖.

[8.] *WHEN the Donatists had power in their hands, they used the Catholics in a barbarous cruel manner, they plundered and forced them from their Habitations.*

the *Dissenters*; for that is the true *English* of prosecuting them on the 35th of *Queen Elizabeth*.

[9.] *THE Donatists were very apt to fall out among themselves.*

[6.] *IN the late Civil Wars, that the Cavaliers might confound the Round-Heads, the Marque's of Ormond had Orders to make a Truce with the bloody Irish, who had murdered 100,000*

[7.] *Mr. Agate has told the World, He can't be easy as long as he has one Dissenter in his Parish; which doubt-*

[8.] *JUST thus the High Church banished the Non-cons 5 miles from Corporations; the zealous Justices of Devon published their pious Resolutions in all the Churches of the County, to Hang or Banish*

[9.] *THUS Mr. Agate falls foul on his Brethren, and reflects upon his Diocesan in the very Pulpit †.*

[10.] *THE*

* *Hist. of Waltham-Abby*, p. 15, 16, 19. † *Hist. of Irish Rebell.* pag. 143. ‖ *V. Reply*, pag. 80. ‡ *V. My Defence*, pag. 93.

[10.] *THE Donatists would tolerate Enormous Vices in their own Party.*

[10.] *MY Antagonist told me in a publick Coffee-House, That the Principles of a Dissenter were worse than the Act*

of one that lay *dead drunk* in the Streets. And I can name some *rejected* by the *Presbyterians* for their *Immoralities*, who have been admitted, not only *into* the Church, but even to *minister* at the *Altar*.

WERE it worth the *Reader's* Entertainment, I might lead him back to the *Conference*, and let him see how the *Parallel* will hold Water there too. When *Passentius* was to Dispute with *St. Austin*, he *refused* to stand to his own *Agreement* *; and when the *Conference* was ended, *St. Austin* and his Friends were bitterly *reviled* by him. Just so *Mr. Agate* agrees to Dispute *Mr. Hallet*, upon such and such Terms; then he hammers out half a dozen *Preliminaries* directly contrary to 'em, and at last Harangues the People from the *Pulpit*, telling 'em, *That his Opponents had neither Conscience, Honour, nor Religion*.

I might easily enlarge under each of these Articles, but the Truth on't is, the *Donatists* might have been guilty of these Crimes without being *Schismatics*; and so may I and *Mr. Agate*, without being *Donatists*. The Question is, Whether this *Gentleman* does not resemble them in those things, in which the very Essence and Being of *Donatism* did consist? A little Examination will discover him to have the very Air and Complexion of one of the Old *African Sectaries*.

(1.) *THE Donatists endeavoured to perswade people, that the true Church was only found amongst them: That no Communion was Lawful but with their Party* †.

(1.) *Mr. Agate* is not able to name one Christian Church in the whole World that he can hold Communion with, except those of the *Episcopal Party* in *England* and *Ireland*, though publickly challenged

* *Pactis conventis minime stabat. Hist: Carthag: coll: apud Dupin, p. 348* † *Optat: de Schif: Donat: L. 2. § 1. Aug: de Unit: Eccles: c. 11, 12.*

lenged so to do ; but sets the *Foreign Protestants* on the same Foot with *Whore-Masters* and *Socinians* *.

(2.) *THEY annulled the Ordinations of the Catholicks, and treated them as meer Laymen* †.

(2.) Mr. *Agate* affirms of those Churches that have only a *Presbyterian Ordination*, (which is the case of all Protestants on t^o other side the Water) That they *Unchurch themselves* ; have no lawful Pastors, no Priests, nor Gospel Promises ‖.

(3.) *THEY declared the Baptism of the Catholicks to be null and void* †.

Baptize to be Christians **.

(3.) *THUS Mr Agate* will not allow the *Presbyterians* to have any such thing as *Sacraments*, or the Children they

THESE were *distinguishing Principles*, and *proper Ear-marks*, of those *African Monsters* ; and I leave the Reader to judge, Whether I or my Opponent do most resemble them in their *Frantick Humours*.

Mr. *Agate*, to let us see that he is a Man of Catholick Principles, tells us [p. 103], That there is no Church upon Earth, that is sound and rightly constituted, but he can joyn in its Communion. But this is only an Amusement ; there is not a Quaker or Muggletonian, not a morose and sullen Sectary, in the two Kingdoms, but will say the same thing ; they are ready (like our Author) to joyn with every Sound Church, that is, their own snivelling little Faction ; for, according to them, all others are unsound, and walk in Darknes. Thus, according to Mr *Agate's* Principles, the Churches of *England* and *Ireland* are the only sound and rightly constituted Churches in the whole World, and to these his Communion is confined.

AS for those narrow Principles objected to him, That *Presbyterian Ordination* is invalid, and the like, They are (says this Gentleman [p. 104]) such Principles, as have ever been maintained

* Pl: Truth, p. 138 † *Invenistis Diaconos, Presbyteros, Episcopos, fecistis Laicos*. Optat: de Schif: Donat: L. 2. § 24.
 ‖ Pl: Truth, p. 109, 63 † *Orbis Terrarum Baptismus exuffatur*, Aug: cont. Parmen: L. 3. c. 6 Vid. etiam con. Petil: L. 3. c. 26 ** Pl: Truth, p. 63, 53

maintained by the Church of England, and by all the Christian World, for 1500 Years together. That this is an Egregious *Falshood*, I appeal to the *Canons* of his own Church, those very *Canons* which he has sworn to make the *Rule* of his *Conformity*. The 55th *Canon* bears this Title, *The Form of Prayer to be used by Preachers before their Sermons*; and one of its *Injunctions* is expressed in these following words: "Ye shall pray for Christ's Holy Catholick Church, that is, for the whole Congregation of Christian People, dispersed thro' out the whole World; and especially for the Churches of *England, SCOTLAND and Ireland*. These *Canons* were compiled by the Bishops and Clergy in Convocation assembled, in the Year 1603: At that very time the *Presbyterian* was the Church-Government by Law Established in the Kingdom of *Scotland*, as it is now. The Church of *England* then was so far from being tinctured with the *Bigotry* of this *Gentleman*, that she owned the *Presbyterian Church of Scotland* to be a true Sister-Church; and ordered all her Clergy to pray for it as such. This is what Mr *Agate* now scorns, and therefore I should be glad to hear how he reconciles his *Ordination Vows* with his *Schismatical Principles and Practices*.

BY this Instance, the *Reader* may guess at the Ignorant Confidence of this *Gentleman*, who pretends, at every turn, to know exactly the Sense and Practice of the Catholick Church for 1500 Years together, whilst he (with all his Noisy Ignorance) understands not the Sense of his own Church, nor the very *Canons* to which he has sworn Obedience.

IN my last, I proved that *Luther, Melancton, Bucer*, and others of our First Reformers, though *meer Presbyters* themselves, did yet Ordain, not only *Ordinary Ministers*, but *Superintendents*, in *Germany**: That the first Protestant Bishops in *Denmark* and *Sweden* had no other than a *Presbyterian Ordination*, and could transmit no other to their Successors ever since. I argued further, That the Protestants beyond the Seas, could not think themselves unhappy for want of *Episcopal Ordination*; because, there were several Bishops that did embrace the *Reformation* in the other Century, particularly the Bishops of *Beavais, Aix and Troies* in *France*, the Bishops of *Brandenburg* and *Cologne* in *Germany*: These might have consecrated others, and so preserve the right Line of

* *V: My Defence, p. 63, &c.*

of Succession, had it been thought Necessary: Or their *Divines* might have come to *England* for Consecration, as the *Scottish Bishops* did. I concluded therefore, That they *despised* (not *Episcopal Ordination*, but) the pretended *Necessity* of it.

THE Reader is desired to observe; That Mr. *Agate* pretends not to confute one of the Instances I have produced: They are taken out of the most *Authentick Histories* that are extant; not out of such scurrilous lowly *Pamphlets* as *Cassandra*, and the *Wolf stripped*. Nay, he grants it to be true, [p. 110.] That the *Lutherans at first had no other than Presbyterian Ordination*; and by consequence they can have no other to this very Day: However, (says this Gentleman, [p. 108.]) *there can't be the least Argument drawn from it*. Yes, sure; I may then argue, That he, like the Ancient *Donatists*, is a *Separatist* from all the Churches in the World, except those of the *Episcopal Party* in *England* and *Ireland*; and that the Pretences which our *High-Flyers* make to *Catholick Union*, are meer Shams.

BUT let us see a little, how our Authour *Rants* against those Churches that have no *Bishops*, (that is, against all the *Protestants* on t'other side the Water.) According to him, [p. 108.] they are *obstinate and perverse*; they are set upon the same Foot with *Jews*, *Turks* and *Socinians*, nay with the *Libertines* and *Adulterers* [p. 109.], that St. Paul condemns, *They despise God's Ordinances, and unchurch themselves*; they have no *Lawful Pastors*, nor *Gospel Promises*. After all these violent Exclamations against the poor *Protestants*, we must suppose him still to be *Debonair* and *Good-humoured*: He has a great Complaisance for the *Church of Rome*, he owns her to be a *true* (though an *unsound*) part of the *Catholick Church* [p. 116.] Our *Homilies* and *Liturgie* accuse that Church of *Idolatry*; this, in the Language of the Scripture, is *Adultery*, and such Churches are stiled *Adulteresses*, *Jer. 3. 9. Ezek. 23. 45.* So that I suppose the *Church of Rome* is a *true Church*, as a *Woman* may be said to be a *true Wife* who runs away from her Husband, and plays the *Whore* with another Man. Is not this a special *Protestant Doctrine*, to represent the *Church of Rome* as a *true Church*, whilst the *Reformed* are nothing else but *Infidel Societies*?

HAVING wounded the Reputation of our *first Reformers*, he pretends to bring a *Plaister*, such as it is, and thus excuses their assuaging to themselves an *Ordaining Power*: [p. 112.] *All that can be said for them, and all that they have said for them-*

themselves, is, That their Circumstances were such, that they could not help it. 'Tis a little unlucky when he begins with an *absolute Falshood*; They have said a great deal more than he allows, and do all affirm, That a *Presbyter* has, originally, as much Power to *Ordain* as a *Bishop*. But let us attend his Proof: He says [p. 112.] *Luther acknowledged Episcopacy was of Divine Right*; for which he quotes Bp. Moreton of *Episcopacy*, p. 156. I have not only consulted the *Bishop*, but had recourse to *Luther* himself, whose words are these: "That every City ought to have its own *Bishop* by Divine Right, I prove by *St. Paul*, who thus says, *Tit. 1. 5. For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the Things that are wanting, and Ordain Elders* (in the Greek *Presbyters*) *in every City*. So that *Luther's Bishops* are the same with our *Presbyters*, and several of them in the same City. That this is *Luther's* Sense, he expressly affirms in these very words, not above a Page distant from the former * "It follows from these words of *St. Paul*, by which he assigns a *Bishop* to every City, (which *Bishops* are now called *Parish Ministers*) that such *Bishops*, *Patriarchs* and *Primates*, as we at present have, are only of an *Humane Right*. So that the *Episcopacy* which *Luther* looked upon as of *Divine Right*, is what every Gospel Minister possesses; and what is more than this, he plainly says is of an *Humane Institution*.

Mr. Agate goes on, affirming [p. 112.] That *Luther acknowledged, that Ordination was so much the peculiar Act of Bishops, that if they could have been had at the beginning of the Reformation, he professed in his Writings and publick Sermons, he would never have Ordained*. For which he cites *Mason's Defence of Ordination*, p. 171. The words quoted by Mr. *Mason* in that page, are not the words of *Luther*, but the Prince of *Anhalt*, and shall be accounted for by and by. In the mean time, I must crave leave to acquaint the Reader, That whereas Mr. *Agate* says, *Luther acknowledges Ordination to be the peculiar Act of Bishops*, this is a perfect Forgery of his own; Mr. *Mason* has no such Expression, and *Luther* contradicts it in a multitude of places.

ANO.

* Sequitur ex verbo Pauli, quo cuilibet Civitati Episcopum tribuit, (qui nunc Plebani dicuntur) Episcopos, Patriarchas, Primates, qui hodie sunt esse Juris humani tantum. *Luth. Resolut. Tom. 1. Folio 309.*

ANOTHER prime Reformer, whom Mr. Agate would fain perfwadethe World was of his mind, is *Martin Bucer*; He was (says our Author, [p. 112]) *entirely for the Divine Right of Episcopacy*, declaring, *That the Three Orders of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, were instituted by the Holy Ghost, and designed to be of perpetual continuance*; For this he quotes Bp. Morton and Durel. The former cites not these words out of Bucer's own Writings, but out of the Jesuite *Saravia*; Mr. Durel gives us a large Quotation out of Bucer, but nothing of this Nature in it: He says indeed *, "That the Holy FA-
 " THERS did institute an Order among the Clergy, by
 " means of which all other Clerks were to be under the special
 " Tuition and Government of the Presbytery, and the Bishop
 " was among the Priests, as a Consul among the Senators. These are Bucer's own words; and I am apt to think the Jesuite has misrepresented him, and my Reason is, Because Bucer did, with others, subscribe to the *Smalcaldick Articles* †, in which tis most expressly said, *That both Jurisdiction and Ordination belong to Presbyters, as well as Bishops*.

BUT why shall we contend about *Luther* and *Bucer*, when *Calvin* himself (as Mr. Agate says, [p. 125]) took *Episcopacy to be of Divine Apostolical Institution*: For this he quotes *Durel's View*, &c. p. 161. Who indeed has these words, "I am (says he) of this mind, that Episcopacy was
 " the Government that *Calvin* approved most, and that he
 " took it to be of Apostolical Institution. So that *Durel* first fancies and conjectures a Thing, and Mr. Agate comes and positively affirms it; but *Calvin* himself confesses no such thing in his Epistle to Cardinal *Sadolet*, as, *That the Discipline of Geneva was defective without it*. He owns indeed, That at *Geneva* they did want the Discipline of the Ancient Church; and the Reason was, Because the Papists had abolished it, and hindered the Restoration of it. But in the whole passage there is not one word of *Episcopacy*; this is foisted in by Mr. Agate to serve his own purpose, nor was that abolished by the Papists. The Church of *England*, in its publick *Liturgy*, confesses, *That the Godly Discipline of the primitive Church is wanting*; but this does not infer a want of *Bishops*, and I know no Reason why *Discipline* and *Bishops* should sig-

* *Durel's Reformed Ch: &c.* p. 218

† *Seckendorf's Hist: Lutheranismi*, L. 3. p. 153, &c.

nify the same thing in *Calvin's Epistles*, more than in the *Common-prayer*.

TIS pity *Beza* should be separated from his dear Friend, and therefore he is next brought upon the Stage. Concerning him, Mr *Agate* says [p. 125], *That speaking of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, he declares, That these Orders were appointed by the Holy Ghost.* Had this Gentleman, instead of taking upon Trust all that he meets with in his *English Authors*, consulted the Original Epistle of *Beza* p. 8, he might have found, *That Bishops, Pastors and Doctors*, are mentioned in the same Sentence, and not as distinct Orders. The Bishop here spoken of, is no more than a Pastor or Parish Minister: That this is *Beza's* Sense, appears from his constant Practice, and that Learned Treatise which he wrote against the Jesuite *Saravia*, on purpose to prove the Identity of Presbyter and Bishop.

I took Notice in my last, That though Mr *Agate* had positively affirmed, *That the Foreign Churches would have Episcopal Ordination if they could, and think themselves unhappy for want of it*, he had not produced one single Testimony to prove his Confident Assertion. To supply that defect, he now opens his Budget [p. 120, &c.] and produces a whole cluster of Evidences, though little to his purpose: The Substance of what he offers is as follows.

THE Lutherans, in their *Apology* for the *Augsbourg Confession*, most solemnly protest *their desire to retain the Polity of the Church.* The Prince of *Anhalt* declares his Willingness to reverence, obey and yield to *Bishops their Jurisdiction and Ordination*: And avers this to be *Luthers* Sense, as well as his own. *Melancton* wishes heartily, *To restore the Government of Bishops.* To which he subjoyns the Testimonies of several *English Divines* affirming, *That the first Reformers were forced, by absolute Necessity, to admit of Presbyterian Ordination.*

AS to what these latter offer, the *Necessity* they talk of, how great soever it was at first, continued but a little while; and therefore, I hope we may be allowed to appeal, from the particular Sentiments of these Authors, to the *Lutherans* themselves, who best knew their own Minds, and the Principles on which they acted. Their Case in brief was this:

THE German Bishops are many of them Temporal Princes, and most of them Men of great Influence and Power; for this Reason, their Concurrence in promoting the *Reformation*

was

was earnestly desired by *Luther, Melancton*, and their Brethren, who tendered their Submission to these Prelates; and offered them, That they should retain their Ancient *Jurisdiction*, provided they would endeavour to purge the Church of those Abuses which had crept into it. Not that they thought Bishops essential to the Being of a Church, or that Ordination could not be performed without them, but purely for Peace sake.

THAT this was their *real* Sense, I prove from an *Edict*, or *Ecclesiastical Constitution*, promulged by the Protestant Elector of *Brandenburg*, in the Year 1539. The Historian tells us, That he procured it out of the late Elector's Library; tis said to be drawn up by the Advice of his most Eminent *Divines* and *Counsellors*. There is one Chapter in it about *Ordination* and the *Episcopal Power*, in which tis expressly said *, "That in the beginning there was no manner of Difference, in respect of *Ordination*, between *Bishops* and *Presbyters*; and that *Bishops* themselves received Imposition of Hands from the *Colledge of Presbyters*. Nevertheless, tis convenient that one of the *Presbyters* be chosen to execute the Office of a *Bishop* and *Superintendent*. And seeing, by the Grace of God, the Bishop of *Brandenburg* had embraced the *Gospel*, the Prince decrees, That all the Ministers of those Churches should be Ordained by the said Bishop: And he reserves the same Authority to all other Bishops in his Dominions, provided they would embrace the present Reformation. Here the Reader may see, in the very same *Constitution*, tis expressly said, That a *Presbyter* has the same Original Power of Ordination with a *Bishop*; and yet this Power is appropriated to a *Bishop*, that the *popish* Prelates might be more easily induced to a compliance.

TO the same purpose speak the whole Body of *Lutheran* Divines, who subscribed to the *Smalcaldick* Articles in these following words: "If the Bishops would rightly discharge their Office, and take care of the *Church* and the *Gospel*, it might be yielded to them, for the sake of *Peace* and *Love*, NOT OUT OF ANY NECESSITY, that they should

* *Refert ---- nullum fuisse ab initio inter Episcopos & Presbyteros ratiōe Ordinationis Discrimen, & Episcopos ipsos eam a Collegio Presbyterorum accepisse per Manuum impositionem, &c.* Seckendorf Hist. Lutheran. L. 3. p. 245.

“ should Ordain and Confirm both us and our Preachers * . These Words are so plain that they need no Commentary, and were composed by *Melancton* †, the very Man whom Mr. *Ag.* introduces as wishing to God *He could restore Episcopacy*, [p. 122.]. This is indeed a full Answer to all the Testimonies produced by this Gentleman, and by *Durel* before him. The Foreign Divines, both *Lutherans* and *Calvinists*, speak respectfully of good Bishops, and think they may be Lawfully admitted in a *Christian Church* (nor have I advanced any thing to the contrary) ; but not one of them all that looks upon a Bishop as *Necessary* to the Being of a Church, or the *Validity* of Ordination.

MY *Antagonist* comes next to prove, That the *Foreign Churches* think themselves *unhappy* for want of *Episcopal Ordination* : This (he says, [p. 123]) is evident from *Boger-* man's *Complement to the Bishop of Landaff discoursing of the Excellency of Episcopacy* ; My Lord (says he) *we are not so Happy*. But this comes far short of proving his Conclusion. *Adam* in *Paradise* was *Happy*, though not so happy as the *Angels* in *Heaven*. And if a Gentleman should address himself to Mr. *Agate*, Sir, *I was not so happy as to enjoy your good Company at such or such a time* ; I hope it does not follow, that the Gentleman must needs be in a miserable Condition for want of it. And the Church of *Holland* may be *Happy*, tho' not so happy as to possess *Far Bishopricks* and *Deaneries*.

BUT not only the President, but the whole Synod of *Dort*, is represented by my *Antagonist* [*Ibid.*] as acknowledging that *Episcopacy* was of *Christ's* own Institution, and that they would be glad with all their Hearts to have that good Order and Discipline among them, that was in the Church of *England* ; For which he quotes *Appendix to the Friendly Debate*, p. 34. The Account which that Author gives is as follows :
 ‘ *Dr. Carlton* discoursing with divers of the best Learned in the Synod, concerning the Usefulness of Bishops, their Answer was, That they did much Reverence the good Order and Discipline

* *Si Episcopi recte Officio suo fungerentur, & Curam Ecclesiae, & Evangelii gererent, posset illis nomine charitatis & tranquillitatis, non ex Necessitate permitti, ut nos & nostros concionatores Ordinarent & Confirmarent.* Seckendorf *Hist. Lutheran.* L. 3. p. 155. † *Ibid.* p. 152.

discipline of the Church of England, &c. Here Mr. Agate is guilty of a double Forgery, in obtruding upon us the Opinion of a few *private* Men, as if it were the Sense of the whole Synod; and then making them say, *that Episcopacy was Christ's own Institution*, when they speak no such thing: So far from embracing such an Opinion, that both *President* and *Synod* subscribed the *Belgick Confession of Faith* *, in the 31st Article of which tis expressly said, 'That all the Ministers of Christ, the whole World over, have the very same Power and Authority. I leave the World to judge, Whether the Persons making such a Subscription, could think themselves *unhappy* for want of Diocesan Bishops. Tis true, the *British* Divines protested against this one Article, but it was, as they themselves declare, not to *offend* other Churches, but *defend* their own †.

FROM *Holland* we are led into *France*, and told [p. 124] That Dr. Du Moulin says, *The Protestants in France wish they might be so happy as to have Bishops; and some others speak of the Happiness of those that live under Episcopal Government.* Not to insist upon *Du Moulin's* being a Prebend of *Canterbury*, and so perhaps a little byass'd by the Dignity he possessed; tis owned, that many of the most Eminent Divines in *France* have spoken Honourably of *Episcopacy*; but that they were far from looking on it as *absolutely Necessary* to the Being of a Church, appears from that publick *Confession of Faith*, to which they all subscribed, in these following Words ||, "We believe, that all true Pastors, in whatever places they may be disposed, have all the same Authority, and equal Power amongst themselves, under *Jesus Christ*, the only Head. Twould indeed have been a mighty Happiness for the *French Church*, if the *popish* Prelates would have embraced the *Reformation*, and instead of *Ravering Wolves*, be *Real Pastors* to the Flock of *Christ*. This is a Felicity I wish them with all my Soul.

IF the *Genevians* invited their Bishops to come amongst 'em, it was not because they thought his company a necessary Ingredient to their Happiness; for upon his Refusal, they have done well enough for more than 150 Years without him.

I argued

* *Acta Synodi Dordrech. printed 1620, p. 302, 313.*

† *Fuller's Ch: Hist: L. 10. p. 82.*

|| *Quick's Synodic: V. L. Introduct. p. 13.*

I argued in my last, That if *Foreign Churches* thought themselves unhappy for want of *Episcopal Ordination*, they might have had recourse to *England*, and sent some of their Divines hither, or some of our Bishops might have made a Trip to them. *Yes, to be sure*, (says Mr. *Agate*, [p. 127]) *the Popish Bishops would be very fond of going so far to promote the Reformation*. But this is a Dust raised on purpose to blind the Eyes of the Vulgar: 'Tis owned, that in the beginning of the Reformation our *English Bishops* were all *popish*; But have they continued so ever since? We have had Protestant Bishops for more than 150 Years amongst us, and can any rational Man believe, that other Churches should think themselves unhappy for want of what they might have obtained an Hundred-times over, had they been desirous of it? Nor was there always a Necessity of travelling a Thousand Miles on either side. In the bloody Reign of Q. *Mary* *, *John Scorie*, Bp. of *Chichester*, took Sanctuary at *Embsen* in *Germany*; and *Miles Coverdale*, Bp. of *Exeter*, owed his Life to the Protection of the King of *Denmark* †. So that the *Lutherans* needed not have gone far to have their broken Line restored, had they been desirous of it.

I mentioned several Bishops in *France* who embraced the Reformation, and might have perpetuated the Succession had they thought it necessary. To this my *Antagonist* replies, [p. 128.] *That these converted Bishops were opposed by the Pope and the King; and Cardinal Richlieu being moved to allow the Protestants Bishops, refused it, saying, They would then look too much like Churches*. But we are not told who the Persons were that made this Proposal to the Cardinal, whether Clergy or Laymen, nor by what Authority they acted. He never was addressed on this Head by any *National* or *Provincial Synod*, by any of their Famous Academies or Professors; and therefore the Sense of their Churches in general, cannot be concluded by the Project or Opinion of a few, whose Names and Characters are utterly unknown. As for the Reformed Churches in *France*, they have undergone a vast Variety of changes, before ever that subtle Cardinal had got the Management of Affairs in his own Hands: They were sometimes prosecuted by *sanguinary Laws* and *cruel Edicts*; their *Ministers*, if taken, were Hanged or Burned alive: And had they

* Fuller's Ch. Hist. L. 8. p. 25. † Ibid: L. 9. p. 64.

they been Bishops, their Danger could not have been greater. Such Prelates as embraced the Reformation, might have Ordained Successors as secretly as perform other parts of their Function, and the Hazard had been the same. At other times, the *Reformed* stood upon their guard, and defended themselves with their Swords in their Hands, being headed at several times by the Princes of *Conde* the Duke of *Alençon*, and the King of *Navarre*. During these Intestine Broils, they had in the Southern Provinces of *France* many great Towns and Cities entirely at their Devotion: In the Year 1598, they had above 200 Garrisons*, and in these places Bishops might have been secure as well as other Ministers, had they been thought equally necessary. And long before this, the Reformation was introduced into the Kingdom of *Navarre* (before it was united to the Crown of *France*) by the Authority and Influence of *Jane d' Albrit*, its Magnanimous and Zealous Queen †; and the Protestant Religion was the Religion by Law Established, in that Little Kingdom, for many Years together. And what could hinder *Episcopacy* from being settled there; had it been thought necessary? Upon the whole, the Protestants were very numerous in *France* some Scores of Years before *Richlieu* sat at the Helm; and whatever Expression dropt from him then, it could not affect those that lived in a former Century.

IN my *Defence*, I mentioned the Bishops of *Brandenburg*, *Cologne* and *Justinople*, who embraced the Reformation, lived in *Germany*, and might have consecrated others; and because they did not, tis evident the Protestants, at that time, did not look upon a succession of Prelates as essential to a Church. To this Mr. *Agate* has nothing to reply, but that there was not one Protestant Bishop in the World when Luther took upon him to Ordain. With this he makes a noise in many places of his Pamphlet. When Luther laid Hands upon *Rorarius*, I believe this may be true, but tis as true that he continued to Ordain, even when there was a Protestant Bishop living in his Neighbourhood. Thus he ordained *Nicholas Armsdorf* in the Year 1541 ||: At that very time *Matthias a Jagow*, Bishop of
K *Brandenburg*

* *A present ils entenoient plus de deux cents petites ou grandes places de surete. Hist: de L' edit de Nantes, T. I. L. 5. p. 222* † *D' avila's Hist: of Wars in France, printed 1647, p. 191* || *Sleidan's Hist: of Refor: L. 14. † Seckendorf's Hist: Lutheran: L. 3. p. 241*

Brandenburg was living, and at no great distance from him. This Prelate declared publicly for the Reformation in 1539 †, and his Death is placed by an unexceptionable Historian in 1544 *. 'Tis true, the Prince of *Anhalt* affirms, "That both he, and *Luther* before him, did frequently and publicly "protest their Readiness to yield both *Jurisdiction* and Or-
"dination to *Bishops*, provided they would admit the *Refor-*
"mation. This is what Mr. *Agate* grounds his Assertion on, That *Luther* would not have pretended to Ordain had there been a Protestant Bishop; and not on *Luther's* own words. The Reason of this Concession has been already hinted at, viz. That the popish Prelates might not be disgusted; and this very Prince of *Anhalt* was so far from looking upon Presbyterian Ordination as null, that he wrote a Treatise on purpose to prove the Validity of it †.

MY *Antagonist*, that he may show his Learning and Good-Humour at the same time, falls most extravagantly foul upon me, for affirming, That the famous *Paul Vergerio* lived several Years after his Conversion amongst the Presbyterian *Grisons* [p. 129.]; and nothing will serve his turn, but I have scandalized the Reformation by this Assertion. Though after all the senseless Rant that he has made, the Matter of Fact is certainly true: Dr. *Heylin* writes thus of *Coire*, their chief City: "On the Introduction of the Reformed Religion, "which they had from the *Switzers* and *Genevans*, the Citi-
"zens withdrew themselves from their Obedience to the Bi-
"shop, and govern themselves in the manner of a Free-State ‖. And if Mr. *Agate* can give us the Name of any one Protestant Bishop, since the Reformation, that has lived amongst the *Grisons* besides this *Vergerio*, I'll own my self in a very great Error; if not, the Reader has another Instance of an excessive Confidence, joyn'd to a profound Ignorance.

I argued in my last, That because the *Ausburg* Confession takes no Notice of the sole Power of Ordination, even when it makes particular mention of the Power and *Jurisdiction* belonging to a Bishop by a Divine Right; that therefore the *Lutherans*, who generally subscribe thereto, acknowledge no such peculiar Power in a Prelate as is pretended. Mr *Agate* indeed
most

† Seckendorf's *Hist.* Lutheran: L. 3. p. 241 * *Ibid.* p. 500. † *Ibid.* p. 499. ‖ *Heylin's Cosmogr.* 2d Edition, pag. 171

most strenuously denies this Consequence, whilst tis most certain, that both the *Opposers* and *Defenders* of this Confession understood it in the very same Sense that I have done. In the Year 1540, *Cochläus* (a Learned *Romanist*) writ his Remarks on this Confession, to be presented to the King of the *Romans*; when he comes to the 14th Article, he thus expresses himself: "The Words (*says he*) are good and right, but the Custom and Meaning of the Protestants is not so; they deprive Bishops of their Ordinary Vocation, and having chosen some *Apostate Monks*, they ascribe to them a pretended Power of Ordaining *Presbyters* and *Deacons* *. That Learned Person who *defends* these Articles against the Cavils of this inveterate Adversary, acknowledges, "That the Protestants deny the Power of Ordination so to depend on *Bishops*, that it is only to be fought at their Hands, though they refuse to correct their deadly Errors †. Thus, though they vastly differ about the *Truth* and *Orthodoxy* of this Confession, they both agree with me in the Sense and Meaning of it.

WHOEVER peruses the *Wirtemberg* Confession with a Mind free from Prejudice, will find, that the *Identity* of a *Bishop* and *Presbyter* is most expressly asserted in it: Nay, this very *Identity* is insisted on as an Argument, to prove, that every Gospel-Minister should be capable of instructing others, in Opposition to the *Popish Priests*, who could only mumble over a few *Masses* when in a Book before their Eyes. The words of this *Protestant* Confession are as follow ||: "St. Paul writes, "That a Bishop should be one that is *apt to teach*; but St. *Jerom* teaches us, That a Bishop is the same with a *Presbyter*: Whence tis manifest, unless a *Priest* be capable of Teaching in the Church, he deserves the name of neither Bishop nor *Presbyter*. So that their *Argument*, if reduced into Form, would thus stand: A *Bishop* must be one that is *apt to Teach*;

K 2

* *Eligunt præterea Apostatas quosdam Monachos, quibus prætenfam tribuunt Potestatem ordinandi Presbyteros & Diaconos.* Seckend: *Hist: Luther: L. 3. p. 287*

† *Negarunt tamen (Protestantes) jus Ordinationis ita dependere ab Episcopis, ut ab illis præcise petenda esset, licet errores Capitales corrigere nollent.* Ibid.

|| *Scribit Paulus, Episcopum Oportere esse Didacticum, Docet Autem Hieronimus eundem esse Episcopum & Presbyterum. &c. Cap. de Ordine.*

Teach ; Every *Presbyter* is the same with a *Bishop*, therefore every *Presbyter* must be *apt* to Teach. Whoever pleases to peruse these Articles with any tolerable measure of Attention, will find this to be the *true meaning* of them.

Mr. *Agate* indeed affirms [p. 131], That *St Jerom* expressly tells us, That *Ordination* was the peculiar *Prerogative* of *Bishops*, which they had been in possession of ever since the *Apostles* days. This *Father* indeed confesses, " That in the Age " in which he lived, (which was the 5th Century) the *Bishop*, " and not the *Presbyter*, did Ordain : But that it had been always so from the *Ap stles* days, he no where affirms ; this is a Fiction of Mr *Agate's* own Brains. So far was *St Jerom* from such a Conceit, that he has this very Expression in one of the places referred to by our Author : " Let *Bishops* know, that " they are greater than *Presbyters*, rather by Custom than a " Divine Institution †.

'Tis confess'd, the Protestants in *Poland* had *Superintendents* ; but then 'twas expressly provided, That their Office should continue but from one *Synod* to another *. And as I might justly argue, that he *QUEEN* of *Great Britain* would be no absolute Sovereign, were it in the Power of a *House of Commons* to place tanother in Her *Throne* every Sessions ; so I may fairly conclude, That the Divine Superiority of these *Bishops* was never thought of when they lay at the Mercy of their own *Presbyters*, either to be confirmed or discarded by 'em.

I just hinted in my last, at the *Smalcaldick Articles* ; to be a little more particular now, the Reader may observe that they were drawn up by *Luther* and *Melancton*, in the Year 1537 : In them 'tis most expressly said, " That *Bishops* and " *Pastors* are not of a different degree by any Divine Right ; " That both *Jurisdiction* and *Ordination* belong to all the " *Ministers* of the Gospel, whether they be called *Bishops* or " *Presbyters*. The Historian tells us, That the most Eminent *Divines* in all the Provinces of *Germany* were present, and subscribed these *Articles* ; particularly those of † *Saxony*,
Eran-

† Ita *Episcopi* noverint se magis *Consuetudine*, quam *Dispositionis* *Dominicæ* *veritate* *Presbyteris* esse *Majores*. *Hieron: Comment: in Tit. 1:5.*

* *V: Polon. Consen. c. de Seperintend.*

† *V: Hickman's Apolog: pro eject: in Anglia Ministr: p. 158. Sickend: Hist: Luther: L. 3. p. 156. || Ibid. p. 153*

Brandenburgh, Hanover, Lunenburgh, Pomerania, Wirtemberg, Hefs, Anhalt and Mansfeld as did the Ministers sent by the Great Imperial Cities of *Frankfort, Hamburg, Bremen*, with many others; so that this may very well be looked upon as the *Sense* of all the Protestants in *Germany*, from which they have not receded to this very Day.

IN discoursing of *Foreign Churches*, Mr. *Agate* often tells his Reader, *That the Lutherans do all live under the Jurisdiction of Bishops*: This he repeats in every other Page, with a peculiar Air of Triumph and Ostentation. If by Bishops he means some Ministers, to whom the Civil *Magistrate* has granted a larger Revenue than to others, with an Authority to supervise the Conduct and Behaviour of their Brethren; this is true, but very *Impertinent*; for all this while they are but *Presbyters*. If by Bishops he means such as have an *Episcopal* Consecration, and pretend to derive their Authority by a constant Succession from the *Apostles*, or to possess it by Virtue of a *Divine Institution*, this is absolutely *false*, nor has he given the least true Proof of it. This being a *Matter of Fact*, I hope the Reader will allow, the *Lutheran* Divines and Learned Men to be the most competent Witnesses in the Case; to them I make my Appeal, who, as far as I can find or hear of, are all unanimous in this, That their Ministers have no other than a *Presbyterian Ordination*.

MY first Witness is *Gothofred Voigtius*, a *Divinity Reader* in *Germany*, who wrote a Book with this Title, *A Presbyterian is the Lawful Minister of Ordination*, which was printed at *Rostoch*, in the Year 1680. In his *Preface*, he acquaints us with the Occasion of his Performance, in these Words *, "Certain Persons, of late come from the *Pope*, have been wandering in these Parts, some coming from *Hildesheim*, and others from other Quarters, who endeavour to persuade People, especially Persons of *Quality*, That the *Ministers* of our Churches are no *Lawful Ministers*. To stop the Mouths of this *Jesuitical Gang*, our Author does not pretend either that they have Bishops properly so call'd, or that the want of them is a Case of *Invincible Necessity*; But he writes a Book on purpose to prove, that *Ordination* by *Presbyters* is *Valid* and

Au-

* *Et multis, etiam illustribus animis persuadere conati sunt non esse Legitimos quos haberemus Ecclesiæ Ministros. Voigtius de Presbytero legitimo Ordinationis Ministro in Præf.*

Authentick. This was the Course he took to silence their unreasonable Clamours.

TO the same purpose speaks *Joachim Hildebrand*, who wrote a Treatise concerning the *Hierarchy of the Ancient Church*; printed at *Helmstat*, in the Year 1702: He affirms, "That the *Papists* look upon all the *Lutherans* as meer Laymen†. And the great Question betwixt us (*says this Learned Man*) is, Whether, in the Days of the *Apostles*, there was "one Order of Bishops, and Another of Presbyters? The *Protestant Churches* hold the *Negative*, and the *Papists* the *Affirmative* ||. The Reader may observe, that in this Testimony the Author mentions the *Identity* of *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, not as his own particular Opinion, but as the General Sense of all *Protestant Churches* in Opposition to the *Romanists*, and that the *Jesuites* in *Germany* make the same bawling Noise that *Mr. Agate* does in *England*, and exclaim against all the *Reformed Ministers* as meer usurping Laymen.

MY third Witness is *Lewis Seckendorf*, Privy Counsellor to the *Electors of Saxony*, who, in Answer to *Maimburg*, has written the *History of Lutheranism* in two Volumes, Folio; printed at *Frankfort*, in the Year 1692: This Author having produc'd several Quotations out of *Luther's* Books, in one of which tis expressly said, *That Bishops and Presbyters are the same Order*, he makes this Observation of his own: "Tis "evident, (*says he* †) that *Luther* built upon a firm Foundation: In vain therefore is it demanded of the *Protestants* by "the Church of *Rome*, with so much Noise and Clamour, "By what Authority their *Ministers* are Called and Ordain'd, So that this *Historian* owns it to be a *Matter of Fact*, That the *Lutheran Ministers* have but a *Presbyterian Ordination*; affirming, that the Objections of the *Papists* on that Account are *groundless* and *unreasonable*.

IN the Year 1669, Dr *Behelius*, Publick Professor in the *University of Strasburg*, published a Book under the Title of *Ecclesiastical Antiquities*; in which he undertakes to prove, *That there is no distinction by a Divine Right between a Bishop and a Presbyter*: And having quoted *St Jerom* as countenancing

† *Pontifici, cum Lutheranos omnes pro Laicis habeant. De Hierar: Vet: Eccles: p. 78 || Ibid: p. 85*

‡ *Hist: Lutheran: L. 3. p. 60, 61*

tenancing his Opinion, (*says he*) " The *Papists* and *English* " *Prelatists* disturb themselves in endeavouring to take this " Man off from us. A plain Intimation, that he himself lookt upon *St Jerom* as countenancing a Parity amongst Gospel-Ministers, and that all the Churches of his Communion took Encouragement from the Authority of so great a Man, to embrace the same Opinion, which was opposed by none but *Papists* and some *English Prelatists*.

IF any thing can be more exprefs than what has been already produced, tis the Testimony of *Dr Osiander*, Chancellor of the University of *Tubingen*, and principal Minister of that Church, who in the Year 1681 published several Treatises of *Casuistical Divinity*; amongst other Questions he proposes this, *Whether a Bishop and Presbyter be Jure Divino different?* In answering which he has these following words: " The " *Popish Doctors* suppose, that *Presbyters* cannot be Ordain'd " but by a *Bishop*, nor a *Bishop* but by three other *Bishops*; " and for this very Reason they deny the Truth of the *Lutheran Ministry* †. Which puts the Matter beyond all Dispute, that the *Lutherans* at this very Day have but a *Presbyterian Ordination*. This is the very City in which the *Bishop of Justinople* breathed his last, after his Conversion from *Papery*: And therefore, if a Succession of *Protestant Bishops* were to be looked for any where in *Germany*, it might be well expected here; and yet no such thing is in the least pretended to.

TO these Authors already mentioned, I might add the Testimony of their Learned Adversary the famous Cardinal *Bellarmino*, who assures us ‖, " That in his Days both *Calvinists* " and *Lutherans* did hold, That the *divine Law* made no difference between a *Bishop* and a *Presbyter*; and for this very " Reason, condemned them as guilty of the *Heresy* of *Aerius*. And none can doubt, but that he was more Conversant with their Writings than *Mr Agate*, who knows little or nothing of them, but what he has collected out of three or four *English* Authors.

I hope

* *Torquent sese Pontificii, & Hierarchici in Anglia, ut hunc Virum nobis eripiant. Antiquit: Eccles: § 1. Art: 2. p. 11* † *Ex hoc Capite Ministerii Lutherani Veritatem impugnant. Theolog: Casual: pt. 5. c. 2. De Minist: Eccles: p. 413* ‖ *Bellarmini Disput: L. 1, c. 14. de Clericis.*

I hope I have sufficiently prov'd, that what Mr *Agate* asserts concerning *Bishops* among the *Lutherans*, is either Impertinent or False. He indeed, with as much Confidence, and as little Truth, affirms [p. 133], That they have no other than a *Prelatical Ordination*; and I am desir'd to give one Instance, where *Presbyters* have ever offer'd to Ordain amongst them [p. 129]. All this is but a Dust rais'd to blind the Reader's Eyes: He owns [p. 110], That the first Protestant Bishops in Germany had but a *Presbyterian Ordination*; and if so, their Successors ever since could have no other. The Truth on't is, the *Lutheran Bishops* and *Superintendents*, at this very Day, are no more than *Presbyters*, to whom the Civil Magistrate has granted a Jurisdiction over the other Clergy within such or such a District: Nay, if the *Jesuites* and Mr *Agate* may be believed, they are all meer *Laymen*, having no such Thing as *Episcopal Consecration*, nor yet pretending to an uninterrupted Succession: This is evident from what has been produced out of their own Authors.

TO which I may add, the Testimony of *Benedict Carpzovius*, Counsellour to the late Elector of *Saxony*, who has written a large Volume concerning the present Constitution of the *Lutheran Churches*, and their Management of Ecclesiastical Affairs; printed at *Leypsick*, in the Year 1695. He lays down this as the Foundation of his Discourse *; " That by Virtue
" of the Pacification at *Passaw*, the *Episcopal Rights* are de-
" volved on the Protestant Princes and States of the Empire;
" for this Reason (he says †) these Princes are called *Bishops*,
" and do exercise both a *Political* and *Ecclesiastical Power*:
" That they do || assume the *Person*, and stand in ‡ the place of
" *Bishops*, within their respective Territories. We are further informed, That the Supream Ecclesiastical Court amongst the *Lutherans*, is what they call *their Consistory* |||, which is composed partly of *Divines*, and partly of *Laymen*, much after the manner of our Prerogative Court in *England*, only the former is constantly in Being. In this Book we have some Hundreds

* *Vigore Pacificationis Religiosæ, Jura Episcopalia Principibus & Statibus Imperii Evangelicis competunt. Carpz. Jurisprudentia Eccles. p. 5. 5 † lb. p. 78 || Principes Evangelici in suis Provinciis sustinent Personam Episcopî. lb. p. 169 ‡ Locum Episcoporum tenent. lb. ||| lb. p. 15.*

dreds of *Rescripts*, or *Edicts*, from the *Supream Consistory* to the *Superintendent* of such or such a Place.

AS for *Ordination*, we are informed by this Learned Author, 'That it is performed by the *Superintendent* and his *Presbytery* * in the common Name of the *Church*. He further adds, 'That when the Power of Ordination is entrusted 'in the Hands of their *Superintendents*, tis the Prince, whom 'he calls *Bishop*, and the *Consistory*, which permits them to 'exercise this Power for Order's sake; and that the *Superintendent* does nothing in this Affair by † his own Power, but 'in the Name, and by the Authority, of the whole Church. We are further informed by this Learned Man, 'That when a 'Superintendent dies, one of the Neighbouring || *Ministers* is 'substituted in his room, whom the Prince thinks fit; and 'that this *Substitute* || has an Inspection over the whole Diocese, and performs EVERY THING belonging to the Office 'of a *Superintendent*, till another be fixed and settled in the 'room of the Deceased. By this the Reader may see, that every thing belonging to the Office of a *Superintendent*, and consequently Ordination, is frequently performed by Ordinary Pastors.

TO what has been now offered, I shall subjoyn the Testimony of an Eminent Divine, who still is, or very lately was, living in *Germany*, who assures us †, 'That to this very Day 'all Protestant Ministers, whether they are called *Superintendents*, or meer *Presbyters*, are equal as to a Power of Ordaining.

I presume, the Evidence produced is sufficient to prove that the *Lutherans* have no such thing as Bishops properly so called, no such Officers as pretend to an *Apostolical Authority* or *Succession*, or any *Jurisdiction* over other Ministers, which they have not derived from the Laws and Constitutions of the

L

Civil

* *Carpzov: p. 30* † *Nil quidquam facit is privato Arbitrio ac Potestate propria, sed Nomine, Jure, &c. lb: p. 64* || *lb: p. 181* || *Substitutus in locum defuncti Superintendentis, usq; dum novus Ecclesiæ præficiatur, in tota Diocesi habeat Inspectionem, omniaq; gerat quæ Superintendenti incumbunt, & ad ejus Officium spectant. lb: p. 182* † *In Hunc usq; Diem omnes Evangelici Pastores, sive Superintendentes, sive simplices Presbyteri vocentur quoad jus Ordinandi sunt æquales. Joach: Hildebrand de Hierarchia vet. Ecclesiæ p. 87, printed 1702*

Civil Magistrate. That they have really no other than a Presbyterian Ordination, and are for this Reason insulted by the Papists just as the *Dissenters* are by Mr *Agate*. This Gentleman indeed talks of an *Inconquerable Necessity* that *Foreign* Protestants labour under, and that they would have Bishops if they could: All this is pure Imagination, and to cure him of his Frenzy, I shall refer him to an Author he himself admires, the Learned Dr *Hicks*, who addresses himself to the *Reformed Churches* on t'other side the Water, in these following words,

* But if this may serve as some Plea for those, who really using all Endeavours, yet could not have *Episcopal Mission*; yet it could serve them no longer than they were in that supposed State of Unavoidable and Insuperable NECESSITY, which never was, nor now is, your case. He affirms further concerning the *Foreign* Protestants, 'That the Necessities they plead are Necessities of their own making and continuing; chosen and wilful Necessities, and by consequence unjustifiable Necessities †.

THE Truth on't is, when the *Papists* object to these great Men that I have mentioned the Want of Episcopal Ordination, there is not one of them that makes this plea of *Insuperable Necessity*: They all affirm, that a *Presbyter* has Originally as much Power to Ordain as a *Bishop*; and tis only Custom, or the Law of the Country, that puts a Difference between them. I appeal to the common Reason of Mankind, Whether *Foreign Churches* can think themselves *Unhappy* for want of an uninterrupted Succession of *Prelates*, when they have done nothing to restore the broken Line? Can we suppose them uneasy in their present Circumstances, when they do not move one Step to alter their Condition? Do they passionately desire the End, and yet make use of no Means in order to obtain it? Had they in their Eyes an Happiness so full of Charms and Attractives, as it is pretended, and would they keep themselves at a cold affected distance for so many Scores of Years together? Did these Churches look upon their present Constitution as lamentably defective, would they not petition those Princes which are of their own Communion, that their Grievances may be redressed? Would they not make one Generous Essay, in Order to correct so Fundamental an Error, as that in which they are pretended to be involved? This cannot be supposed, without casting

* Hicks *Pref. to the Christ: Priesthood*, p. 197 † *Ibid*: pag. 193

casting a most grievous Reflection on all their Eminent Divines and Famous Synods, their Learned Academies and Glorious Confessors, as if they were all of a most supine and careless Temper.

IF Mr *Agate* thinks fit to engage any further in a Debate about the Foreign Protestants, I would make this Proposal to him, which I think very Just and Reasonable, *vis.* That he would not amuse his Reader with Quotations out of *Direl*, in which their Divines make an Honourable Mention of good Bishops, of such as we had, and still have in this Island. The Question is not, Whether a *Stillingfleet* or a *Tillotson* deserves to be treated with due Respect and Deference, and a Regard had to their Character: But the Question is, Whether Bishops are Successors to the Apostles, and absolutely Necessary to the very Being of a Church? In this particular, all the Protestants beyond the Seas are on my side. If my Antagonist pretends to prove the contrary, let him name that one Church that he can hold Communion with out of the Queens Dominions; or that one Protestant Bishop, that pretends to an Uinterrupted Succession from the Apostles: Let him produce the Declaration of any Protestant Synod, or University; nay, let him but produce the Testimony of any two Divines of Note and Eminence amongst them, who declare Presbyterian Ordination to be Null and Invalid, or pretend to any other themselves, and I will own my self in a very great Mistake. If he can do nothing of this Nature, let him for Shame retract that Egregious FALSHOOD which he has published to the World, [pag. 119] That there is not one of the Foreign Churches but have publicly condemned me and my Followers. But if Mr. *Agate* attempts a thing of this Nature, I expect that he should translate his Authors a little more justly, than he has done *Chemnitius*, when he produces him affirming, That Ordination is the Bishops Right [p. 137]; as if it were his Sole Right, exclusive of Presbyters: Whereas his words are, as cited by this Gentleman in the Margin*, True Bishops rightly claim a power of Ordaining: This is what I know no Person that denies them. But *Chemnitius* was far from thinking they only had a power of setting Men apart to the Ministerial Office.

Notwithstanding all the Noise that the Geneva Letter has made in the World, what I observed in my former is not disproved by this Gentleman; they no where affirm, That the

L 2

Dissenters

* *Veri Episcopi recte hoc sibi arrogarent.*

Dissenters are *Schismatics*, or their Teachers no *Ministers*. He endeavours to persuade the World, That I have represented the *Genevans* as the vilest *Hypocrites*, because I suppose them to be obliged in Policy, as well as Decency, to speak with Deference and Respect, of the *Church of England*. For my part, I thought that the Wisdom of the *Serpent* might sometimes be united to the *Dove's* Innocence; but belike, Mr. *Agate* knows no Difference between Civility and Hypocrisy; well seeing he has openly discovered himself, we may know for the time to come, what Judgment to pass upon his *Complements and Cringes*.

I shall conclude this Treatise, as I did my former, with a Set of AGATISMS; not to mention the Stories of *Ferguson* and *Nowland*, though absolute Falshoods, because for them he has produced his Vouchers. The Reader may guess what Credit his Book deserves, by perusing this following List, which contains Some of his Many FORGERIES.

I. IN his Preface, he charges the Author of the Rights with pronouncing it a Thing Indifferent, whether we believe there is a God or no! Whereas there is no such Expression in his whole Book, nor any thing like it.

II. [p. 63] He affirms, That Jesuites and Romish Enmissaries are used to preach and pray amongst Dissenters in their Conventicles; and [p. 68] tis a very common thing for them to preach and pray in their (the Dissenters) Conventicles. 'Tis plain he does not himself believe this to be true, in that he does not so much as pretend to give one Instance of this Nature, ever since our Religious Assemblies have been publicly allowed, which is now near 20 Years ago.

III. [p. 68] He pretends to give us an Abstract of those Directions which the Pope gave to Romish Enmissaries; amongst other things, they were to cry up Extempore prayer: But this, as well as a great part of the Harangue, is an Addition of Mr. *Agate's*, there being no such thing to be found in the Pope's Bull.

IV [p. 70] One Malone, a Friar, was sent to distract the Protestants, by devising new Doctrines, and acting the Puritan.

ran. His acting the Puritan, is foisted in by Mr *Agate*, his own Author says no such thing.

V *Ibid.* Throgmorton confessed, That he knew above 12 Romish Emissaries, that preached amongst the Puritans. The preaching of these Fellows among the Puritans is a perfect Forgery, nor did Throgmorton make any such Confession.

VI [p. 72] One Ramsey, a Romish Priest, preached sometime among the Holy Brethren the Presbyterians and Independents. The Presbyterians are foisted in by Mr *Agate*, when his own Author makes no mention of them.

VII [p. 73] In the Year 1641, John Brown preached downright Popery in the Conventicles of the Covenanters. At that time the Covenanters kept no Conventicles, but were possessed of the publick Churches.

VIII *Ibid.* Thomas Gage, a Jesuite in Masquerade, preached in Kent among the Independents. This Gage never was a Jesuite*, but a Dominican; he preached his Recantation Sermon at St Pauls, by Order of the Bishop of London†; And I have been well assured that he died a Protestant.

IX *Ibid.* Father Bernard, in a Pamphlet printed 1650, gives us a long Catalogue of Romish Priests, that frequented the Meetings of Presbyterians and Independents, thumping the Pulpit undiscovered many Years. This Bernard says no such thing, nor were there any such Meetings at the time referred to; but the Presbyterians preached in publick Churches.

X [p. 74] Dr Oats says, nay swears, That White, Morgan and Ireland, preached in Scotland under the Notion of Presbyterians. The Doctor only says, they were employed to preach, but no where affirms, that they actually did preach, or had any Opportunity to execute their Instructions.

XI. [p. 92] The Ministers of the Church of England be (Mr Tros) says are grossly Ignorant, dangerously Erroneous,

* Gage's *Suru: of the W. Indies*, p. 12 † *Ib.* p. 211

notoriously Prophane, &c. Mr Tross passes no such Censure on all, or the generality of the Clergy, he only affirms, That when a Minister is so ill qualified, tis Lawful to leave him, and attend upon another.

XII [p. 95] *They (the Dissenters) are linked in Confederacy with all the Deists and Libertines in the Nation; and hug the accursed Author of the Christian Rights.* This is an absolute Falshood, and he is defied to prove his Charge.

XIII [p. 98] *The Dissenters Employ and Relieve none but those of their own party.* Another most Notorious Untruth!

XIV [p. 112] *Luther acknowledged, That Ordination was the peculiar Act of Bishops.* A pure Invention of Mr. Agate! Luther made no such Acknowledgment.

XV [p. 125] *They (the Synod of Dort) acknowledged, that Episcopacy was Christ's own Institution.* That Synod made no such Acknowledgment; all that is pretended, is, that some of its Members spoke Honourably of the Church of England to Dr Carlton*.

XVI [p. 125] *Calvin confesses, That the Discipline of Geneva was defective without Episcopacy, and that he endeavoured to restore it, but was opposed.* Calvin in Truth makes no mention of Episcopacy in the place referred to; the Discipline which he endeavoured to restore, was such as the Papists had abolished; which could not be Episcopacy, for that was never abolished by them.

XVII [p. 131] *St Jerom expressly tells us, That a power to Ordain was the peculiar Prerogative of Bishops, which they had been in possession of ever since the Apostles Days.* A mere Invention of Mr Agate's! St Jerom has no such Expression.

XVIII [p. 135] *According to Father Baxter, Bishops are the Devil's Instruments.* Mr Baxter passes no such Censure on them.

XIX

* V: Append: to Friendly Debate, p. 34

XIX [p. 94] *The Communion-plate which belonged to St David's, was put to the common Uses of a publick House, by Old G— (that is Goswell) at the Oxford-Inn. Mrs Hoar, who still keeps that Inn, and who lived with Mr Goswell when this was pretended to be done, affirms, That no Church-plate was so employ'd.*

XX [p. 97] *Coblers and Tinkers are Preachers among the Dissenters at this Day. If he means the Presbyterians, tis a Falshood; if others, tis a grand Impertinence.*

ALL that I desire of the Reader is, That he would consult the Authors Mr Agate has abused, and I leave him to judge, Whether FORGERIES and FALSHOODS will prove an Honour or Support to His, or any other CAUSE.

F I N I S.

POSTSCRIPT.

TH^O these Papers were prepared for the Press before Mr. *Agate's* Second Part was published, yet there is one Notorious Calumny in that Book, relating to my self, which calls for an immediate Vindication, which the Reader will find in the following Certificates.

WHereas Mr. *Agate* has asserted, [*Plain Truth*, Part 2d. p. 108.] That the *Printers* are ready to Certify, That Mr. *Withers* brought the Copy of his late Book to them; but there being a great deal of *Mis-spelling* and *false English* in it, they did not think fit to print it, for the Credit of their Press, till it had passed some farther Corrections and Amendments: I must Attest, That Mr. *Agate* hath been misinformed, and that no part of Mr. *Withers's* Copy was refused to be printed upon the Account of any False English in it, or returned to be further Corrected.

Jos. Bliss.

WE whose Names are hereunto subscribed do Certify, That Mr. *Sam. Farley* did, in our hearing, solemnly declare, That Mr. *Withers* never brought any part of his Copy to the Printing-House, which was refused to be printed upon the Account of its False English, or which was carried away to be further Corrected.

Jos. Hallet.

John Atkin.

Will. Reynolds.

Mr. *Farley* was so Just as to offer me to make the same Declaration before a *Magistrate*. But this is enough to give Men a Taste of Mr. *Agate's* Honesty, and the Truth of those other Tales he has collected.

7 JU 66

ERRATA.

PAge 10 l. 31 read *Amusement*; p. 12 l. 14 r. *Profelytes*; p. 22 & *passim* r. *Commun*; *ib.* l. 29 r. 1678; p. 39 in *Margent*, r. *Corporis*; p. 45 in *Margent*, r. *Cæcilianum*. And lest the Reader, who has only seen *Foxes* and *Heybrands*, may fancy me to be guilty of a worse Thing than a Mistake in what is related p. 22, concerning Dr *Nelson*, whom Mr *Ware* calls *Henry*, I must add, That the Doctor in his *Historical Collections* writes himself *John*; and I hope he best knew his own Name.

is
the
of
at
ut
it,
is,
s:
nd
ed
ba
y.
y,
ly
oy
on
ay

h.
e-
en
er

;
in
m.
s,
in
re
m